The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, AUGUST 22, 1863.

THE CESSATION of the *Gazette of Bankruptcy* was lately made an excuse for repeating in the *Law Times* some statements which were intended to be injurious to this journal. The proprietor of the *Law Times* appears to hope, by impudent reiteration of calumnies—over and over again proved by us to be such—to damage our interests. Our intention was to take no further notice of these unworthy attacks; nor should we do so now, had it not been for the request of some of the gentlemen connected with the *Gazette of Bankruptcy*, who naturally feel indignant at such a person as the proprietor of the *Law Times* referring to them as "adventurers of the press." These gentlemen object to be held up as a "frightful example," and a professional warning, by the most notorious and unsuccessful manufacturer of journals of all kinds known to the annals of speculative journalism. Whoever wishes for information on the subject may learn a good deal from a very lengthened article which appeared in the *Athenæum* of the 28th of October, 1854, in which the writer exposes with great spirit the audacious system of puffery, and the unparalleled impudence, by which it is attempted systematically to make a set of journals—some of them utterly obscure and worthless, and all of them manufactured by the same individual—to play into the hands of one another, and thus to produce profit out of what is commercially worthless. The following extract speaks for itself:—

We turn to the general list and note the pretended circulation of Mr. Cox's journals. The figures appear as follows:—

Critic	5,194 (bi-monthly)
Law Times.....	3,206 (weekly)
Journal of Auctions	2,250 (bi-monthly)
County Courts Chronicle	910 (monthly)
Clerical Journal.....	2,150 (bi-monthly)

On a former occasion (see *Athenæum*, No. 1382) we dealt with the mystery of the figures standing against the name of the *Critic* in this enumeration, and we do not care to return to the subject. We understand the trick by which a circulation of 5,000 copies is made to appear on paper. Mr. Cox's journals are like the armies of the Czar. They look magnificent in returns—they are exceedingly difficult to find in the field. We are content with having proved, by the returns of the principal houses engaged in the distribution of literary journals, that the regular and legitimate sale of the *Critic* by the trade is next to nothing.

We proceed, therefore, to the next paper on the list—the *Law Times*. The story of this journal—as told in *Frazer's Magazine* (November, 1852)—is odd enough; but we are now dealing with the question of the relative advantages offered by these Cox-journals to the advertisers as against those of our contemporaries—not with their histories. One point at a time. A very foolish and improbable story is told in the *Handbook* [one of the Cox-publications then under review] in these words:—

"The writer some time since wanted to sell a harp. He advertised it three times in the *Times*, and got two answers only; twice in the *Daily News*, and got three applications; and once in one of the *legal* papers, and received *fourteen* applications, and sold it within a week. A friend of his did the same with a picture of some value, and with very nearly the same results. There was no mistake as to the source of the applications, for the advertisements were inserted in the three journals at distant intervals, and not until one had failed was another tried."

A note to this story informs the reader that the legal journal referred to was the *Law Times*. Thus it is insinuated that your only medium for advertisements of harps and pictures is Mr. Cox's *Law Times*. Such is their influence, such their power, that when the *Times* fails signally and the *Daily News* labours in vain, Mr. Cox's journals win at a canter. The *Law Times* is first—THE *Times* nowhere. The tale provokes scrutiny. Journals with such a power ought to have an immense popularity. Besides making the fortune of their owner, they ought to bear—like the *Times* and the *Athenæum*—no small share of the public burthens. We look with interest, therefore, to the stamp returns; and we are startled and amused by the audacity of the mystification there exposed to view. Like Mrs. Malaprop's Cerberus, it turns out that the *Law Times* is "three gentlemen rolled into one."

We must explain. In the "Handbook for Advertisers" we have lists of these three journals, with their several circulations, professedly copied from the Stamp-office Returns:—

Law Times	3,206 (weekly)
Journal of Auctions	2,250 (bi-monthly)
County Courts Chronicle	910 (monthly)

Here are three journals professing to consume 6,366 stamps, and claiming to have a stamped circulation to that extent. What says the Stamp-office Returns? *That this statement is absolutely untrue.* No stamps are issued to any *Journal of Auctions*. No stamps are issued to any *County Courts Chronicle*. These journals are not known at the Stamp-office. Do they exist at all? Yes, assuredly. We send for copies, and find that they are all printed on the stamps of the *Law Times*. The three journals bear one and the same stamp; and the *Law Times* takes credit for the whole. The total number of stamps issued to this *Law Times* in 1853 was 166,700, or nearly 3,206 for each of its weekly impressions, as claimed for it by the "Handbook." But this consumes the whole—leaves none for the *Journal of Auctions* and the *County Courts Chronicle*. If the *Journal of Auctions* really circulates 2,250, and the *County Courts Chronicle* 910, a child can tell how many are left for the *Law Times*. Some part of the circulation given to these journals must be fictitious, and the statement of the "Handbook" must be false.

Have not all who advertise—in fact, the whole public—a right to demand from the publisher of this "Handbook," and the only person whose name appears in connexion with it—an explanation of these extraordinary misrepresentations? Here is something beyond puffery and bad taste. The question raised is one of literary honour and business integrity. Every man misled by such statements into advertising in any of the Cox-journals has a grievance against this "Handbook" which a jury would most likely recognise and redress.

Does the reader still *suspect* that the anonymously written and anonymously printed "Handbook" comes from the same press as the *Critic*, the *Law Times*, and their fellows?

We would rather be excused the trouble, in this vacation time, of furnishing a catalogue of the numerous other newspaper speculations which have emanated from the *Law Times* office since the foregoing article was penned. To do so we should have to ransack the light literature of the Stock Exchange, as well as of the agricultural, the polite, the scholastic, the mercantile, the romantic, the sporting, and the religious worlds. It is enough to mention that at the very time when the proprietor of the *Law Times* was speaking of the "disastrous end of the Law Newspaper Company"—the fact, as he well knew, being that the company was voluntarily dissolved when it had fulfilled its object by establishing this journal—; when he was complaining that "the adventurers of the press appeared to think themselves exempted from the law of demand and supply"—his own latest newspaper speculation, the *Investors' Journal*, had ceased to exist, under circumstances of the most unhappy character, such as would have made any man of ordinary delicacy deprecate any reference to it. That publication (the *Investors' Journal*) took its rise, as many others have done, in the columns of the *Law Times*, and when it started into a separate existence was published at the same office, as many others are. As a matter of good taste, we had determined upon taking no notice whatever of its decease; but when its proprietor makes use of the columns of the *Law Times* for the purpose of offering offence to the proprietors and other gentlemen connected with the *Gazette of Bankruptcy*, and to the 200 solicitors who founded this journal, we think it right, once for all, to give our readers the advantage of knowing what a respectable journal like the *Athenæum* has to say of the gentleman who penned the homily on the

failure of the *Gazette of Bankruptcy*. We have been urged to reprint the article in full, and also another on the same fruitful theme which has appeared in *Fraser's Magazine*; but, however amusing these pungent criticisms might be to our readers, we desire to give them something more edifying, though perhaps not more entertaining, for their perusal. Nothing but a sense of justice, and of the necessity of informing the legal profession on a subject about which it ought not to be ignorant, could have induced us to devote so much of our space to such a topic.

Sir Cresswell Cresswell's death and the appointment of his successor have naturally given rise to considerable comment upon the peculiar jurisdiction and functions of the Judge Ordinary, as they are regulated by existing Acts of Parliament. It is urged that the whole work of the two courts—Probate and Divorce—is too much for one judge; and that, at all events, there ought to be a repeal of the Acts which give jurisdiction to the Judge Ordinary, sitting alone, in cases where the original Act, which constituted the court, required a full court of three judges. From the first of these suggestions we wholly dissent. The two courts have not hitherto supplied nearly enough business for two judges sitting separately, or more than experience has shown could be satisfactorily disposed of by one; and if this was the case when both courts were new, and their procedure unsettled, it is not less likely to be so now that the business has begun to get into a groove. One tribunal has got through the work with tolerable ease, and there is no reason why it should not still do so. The appointment, therefore, of a separate Judge of the Court of Probate, with equal rank and salary, would be a heavy expense without justification; while a judge of lower rank and emoluments would probably not give that satisfaction that is afforded by the present arrangement. There is certainly nothing like sufficient business for a separate Judge of Probate, and such an appointment would only be justifiable, in case of the reconstitution of the Court of Divorce, by requiring the judges of the two courts to sit together in all cases where originally a full court of three judges was requisite. We are decidedly opposed to the legislative changes which have been made in this respect, and think that all suits for dissolution or nullity of marriage, as well as all applications for new trial in jury cases, ought to be heard and decided by a court composed of not less than two judges; but of these, the one being the Judge Ordinary, the others or other ought to be, if possible, supplied from among the existing judges. It is highly desirable, for many reasons, to guard against the isolation of tribunals, and the consequent peculiarity of their procedure; and the best mode of preventing the growth of this evil is by constituting, as far as possible, a homogeneous Bench for all our various tribunals. While, therefore, we are in favour of a reconstitution of the Court of Divorce, and of the reinforcement of its judiciary in its most important business, we are opposed to the accomplishment of these desirable ends by a violation of the principle which, only a few years ago, dealt so heavy a blow to *peculiar* jurisdictions throughout the country.

The laws of Ireland, unlike those of Scotland, have always been closely similar to those of England; nor, where differences existed, has the advantage always been on our side. Witness, for instance, the Irish system of registration for the whole kingdom, established in the 6th of Anne; and also the Irish system of conveyancing by a deed of release, founded not upon an actual lease, but merely upon a recital thereof—an improvement not adopted by us prior to the passing of the 4 Vict. c. 21. We are not aware of any considerable change in English law that has been made at any time without its being soon extended to Ireland. The reforms carried out by our Common Law Procedure Acts were, to a great extent, embodied in the corresponding Irish Acts; and the Irish chancery system likewise has undergone several organic reforms since the year 1850. It appears, however, notwithstanding the great changes made in Irish equity and common law proceedings at the commencement of the last decade, that the reforms did not (for what reason we cannot see) precisely correspond to those effected in England; and the divergencies that then occurred have been since perpetuated and increased. The report of the Royal Commissioners who have just concluded their labours on this subject has been issued, and contains a vast mass of interesting and important legal matter. The commission was composed of sixteen of the most eminent judges and Queen's counsel in both countries, including Mr. Justice Willes, who was one of the authors of the English Common Law Procedure Act, as also Lord Chief Justice Monahan and Messrs. Brewster and O'Hagan. The common law portion of the report consists of various heads of recommendations:—first, the reforms adopted in England which appear superior to those adopted in Ireland; secondly, the advantages possessed by the law of Ireland; and thirdly, such of the peculiarities of Irish practice as ought to be continued, together with suggestions of further reforms for both countries. We have already noticed the most important of these recommendations so far as they affect England.

The Friendly Societies Act, 1855, 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63, consolidates and amends the law relating to Friendly Societies, and may now be regarded as a code for the government of such bodies, so far as they are distinguishable from the societies which are governed by the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1862. The latter are in fact a peculiar kind of limited joint-stock company, "for the purpose of carrying on any labour, trade, or handicraft, whether wholesale or retail (except the working of mines and quarries, and the business of banking), and of applying the profits for any purpose allowed by the Friendly Societies Acts, or otherwise permitted by law."

The objects of friendly societies constituted under the Act of 1855, or under any of the prior Acts which it consolidates, are especially enumerated in the Act, and are as follows:—

1. For insuring a sum of money to be paid on the birth of a member's child, or on the death of a member, or for the funeral expenses of the wife or child of a member.

2. For the relief or maintenance of the members, their husbands, wives, children, brothers or sisters, nephews or nieces, in old age, sickness, or widowhood, or the endowment of members or nominees of members at any age.

3. For any purpose which shall be authorised by one of her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, or in Scotland by the Lord Advocate, as a purpose to which the powers and facilities of this Act ought to be extended.

Provided that no member shall subscribe or contract for an annuity exceeding £30 per annum, or a sum payable on death, or on any other contingency, exceeding £200.

The Act provides that a contribution is to be made for the expenses of management, and it appears that in several friendly societies some items of an extraordinary character are included under this head. Mr. Tidd Pratt, the registrar of these societies, has therefore laid a case before the Attorney-General for his opinion upon the questions raised by such proceedings. He mentions the case of one society in which the following items were charged:—Liquor at monthly meeting, £9; Band at the anniversary, £6; dinners to persons carrying banners, 6s. 9d.; donation to Lancashire relief fund, £5; grant for procession and dinner on the marriage of H. R. H. the Prince of Wales, £10;—and he says that charges for feasting, and processions at anniversaries, the purchase or hire of banners, ribbons, aprons, and personal decorations of various kinds, for bell-ringing, &c., also occur in the accounts of some friendly societies.

The following are the questions submitted to the Attorney-General:—

Your opinion is requested, 1st, whether any of the funds

raised under the authority of the 9th or 25th sections of the Act can be legally applied to any of the items of expenses above mentioned, or to any similar items?

2nd. Whether any of the funds raised under the authority of a rule for incidental expenses can be legally applied to any of the items of expense above-mentioned, or to any similar items, and whether incidental expenses must not be such as are necessary to, or connected with, the purposes for which the society is established?

3rd. Should the opinion be that neither of the funds can be legally applied to the expenses referred to, can proceedings be taken under section 24 against the member or officer paying away the funds for such purpose, for wilfully applying "the funds to purposes other than those expressed or directed in the rules?"

4th. Can any member aggrieved at such expenditure being incurred commence proceedings under section 24, as being "a person on behalf of such society?" or, must the consent of the society be first obtained; and if that cannot be obtained, can proceedings be taken except by the registrar under 23d and 24th Vict. c. 58, sec. 9.?

ANSWER.

1st. I am of opinion that no part of the funds raised under the authority of the 9th or 25th sections of the Act can be legally applied to any of the items of expenses above-mentioned or to any similar items. They are entirely unconnected either with the insurance and relief, &c., mentioned in the 9th section, or with the expenses of management referred to in the 25th.

2nd. I think that no part of any funds raised under the authority of a rule for incidental expenses can be legally applied to any of the items of expense above-mentioned, or to any similar items. The expression "incidental expenses" must be reasonably understood, and, within those limits, may receive a liberal interpretation; but it is clear that the meaning cannot be stretched beyond matters necessary to, or directly connected with, the main purposes for which the society is established.

3rd. Proceedings may be taken against the member or officer paying away the funds for any of these purposes, provided in doing so he is guilty of a "wilful" misapplication of the funds. In order to put the wilfulness beyond a reasonable doubt, I would advise that the attention of the various officers, &c., charged with the custody and disbursement of the funds should be pointedly called to the state of the law on this subject, and that they should be apprised that future misapplications will be treated as wilful, and punished accordingly.

4th. I am of opinion that no person, other than the registrar, can commence proceedings under section 24 without the consent of the society to his so doing being first obtained; but that, independent of any such consent, proceedings may be taken by the registrar under 23 & 24 Vict. c. 58, s. 9.

(Signed) WM. ATHERTON.

Temple, July 24, 1863.

Mr. Tidd Pratt has announced that, under the advice of the Attorney-General, as above-mentioned, it is the intention of the Registrar of Friendly Societies in England to take proceedings pursuant to 23 & 24 Vict. c. 58, s. 9, against any officer, &c., of a friendly society who shall offend against the provisions of the 18 & 19 Vict., c. 63, s. 24.

MR. TITIAN J. COFFEY, the *ad interim* United States Attorney-General, has written an opinion for his Government on the question whether the act of dispatching an American vessel to a neutral port, in ballast, though its ultimate destination as a blockade-runner is all but certain, is an offence against the laws of the United States, for which arrests may be made, and parties concerned in such enterprises may be prosecuted, and, if convicted, punished? His opinion is in the affirmative, and turns mainly on the construction of an American statute which was passed in 1862, for the purpose of suppressing the insurrection. We quote, for the information of our readers who are interested in maritime law, the latter portion of this opinion—the former part only laying down some unquestionable propositions. The doctrine contained in the concluding part of the extract which we give will be a surprise to English maritime lawyers. Mr. Coffey thus delivers himself:—

The question whether the mere act of dispatching an American vessel to a neutral port, in ballast, for the purpose of running the blockade therefrom, not followed by an actual running or attempt to run the blockade, would of itself constitute an offence within and punishable by our criminal statutes, deserves careful consideration. The second section of the Act of the 17th of July, 1862, provides comprehensively enough for the punishment of the offence of actually inciting, setting on foot, assisting, or engaging in rebellion or insurrection, or of giving aid or comfort thereto, or of engaging in or giving aid or comfort to an existing rebellion or insurrection, but it fails to include the class of acts which, whilst done with the intent to do these things, do not of themselves amount to actual assistance or aid and comfort to the rebellion or insurrection.

The question, then, is whether the act of dispatching an American vessel from a port of the United States to a neutral port, in ballast, with the ascertained purpose of there taking in cargo to run the blockade, of itself amounts to actual assistance or aid and comfort to the rebellion, within the statute. I think it does, for this reason: such a vessel started from an American port with intent to run the blockade would, in my opinion, be subject to lawful capture as prize of war from the moment she left that port. It is a well-settled principle in the law of blockade that the act of sailing with an intent to break a blockade is deemed a sufficient breach to authorise confiscation. From that moment the blockade is fraudulently invaded, and the vessel is liable to capture, without reference to the distance between the port of departure and the blockaded port, or to the extent of the voyage performed. (3 Phil. 390-400, and cases cited. 5 Cranch, 343-9 lb.; 440 Story, J.) Whether a neutral vessel proceeding from one neutral port to another neutral port, with intent there to take in cargo, and from thence to run the blockade, is liable to capture and condemnation before she reaches the port at which she is to receive her cargo, it is not necessary now to decide, although from the language of Lord Stowell, in the *Jonge Pieter* (4 Rob. 89), I infer that such was his opinion. But however this may be, he distinctly asserts in that case, that if a subject of the blockading country ship goods to go to the enemy through a neutral country, they are liable to capture and condemnation. For, as he says, "without the licence of Government, no communication, direct or indirect, can be carried on with the enemy. . . . The interpositon of a prior port makes no difference; all trade with the enemy is illegal, and the circumstance that the goods are to go first to a neutral port will not make it lawful." Of course, if the goods shipped on such a venture may be condemned, a vessel started from a port of the blockading country with the intent to take in cargo at a neutral port, and from thence run the blockade, and thus to hold illicit intercourse with the enemy, is equally guilty and liable to capture and condemnation.

If, then, an American vessel, starting from an American port, in ballast, with such a purpose, be a lawful prize of war, it follows that, from the time of her departure for the neutral port, it is as much the duty of our cruisers to capture her as if she were actually entering a blockaded port with full cargo. And the moment she is placed in this predicament the persons who despatched her on her guilty errand become liable to the penalties of the second section of the Act of the 17th of July, 1862. For whenever the vessel they have started is in such a position as to impose on our cruisers the duty of arresting her voyage by her capture, then these persons have actually and materially assisted the rebellion by adding to the duties of our cruisers that of pursuing and capturing her, which involves necessarily their withdrawal, for the time, from other service. If necessary, it would be easy to illustrate in a variety of ways the effective assistance which might be rendered to the rebellion by the mere act of dispatching vessels, in ballast, to neutral ports, with the ultimate purpose of running the blockade. The right, and consequent duty, of capturing such vessels off our coast, before they reach the intermediate neutral ports, might well give so much employment to our navy as to diminish its effectiveness elsewhere, or require a considerable addition to its force. To create this necessity would, in contemplation of law, be to assist and give aid and comfort to the rebellion in a form only less aggravated than the actual fitting out of vessels of war for rebel use. And of this offence within the terms of the statute I have cited are those persons guilty, in my opinion, who dispatch American vessels in ballast, from our own ports, with intent to stop at neutral ports, and, after there taking in cargo, from thence to run the blockade. The unlawful purpose being established, the offence is committed whenever the vessel shall have started on her voyage, whether it be consummated at the blockaded port, or be arrested after she has left, or before she has reached the intermediate neutral port.

Mr. Carter, the coroner for Surrey, threw out some observations the other day, at an inquest, which show in a startling light the difference between obligations that are "imperfect" and lie within the province of Morals, and those which are within the domain of Jurisprudence, and therefore enforceable under legal sanctions. "The duty," he said, "of saving a drowning man is not compulsory upon anyone;" and he concluded by stating that "if a man passing along the bank saw a boy fall into the river, and the mere fact of his stretching out his hand could save him, and he did not do it, still it was no part of the coroner's duty to take cognizance of the matter." The Indian Penal Code, which is contained in an Act passed by the Legislative Council in 1860, comprises in its notes and glosses some curious attempts to draw the line between legal and merely moral homicide, or between punishable and unpunishable causes of death. Numerous definitions and examples are there given. Here is one:—

Whoever causes death by doing an act with the intention of causing death, or with the intention of causing such bodily injury as is likely to cause death, or with the knowledge that he is likely by such act to cause death, commits the offence of culpable homicide.

Then follow these illustrations:—

(*a*) A. lays sticks and turf over a pit, with the intention of thereby causing death, or with the knowledge that death is likely to be thereby caused. Z., believing the ground to be firm, treads on it, falls in, and is killed. A. has committed the offence of culpable homicide.

(*b*) A. knows Z. to be behind a bush. B. does not know it. A., intending to cause, or knowing it to be likely to cause, Z.'s death, induces B. to fire at the bush. B. fires, and kills Z. Here B. may be guilty of no offence; but A. has committed the offence of culpable homicide.

(*c*) A., by shooting at a fowl with intent to kill and steal it, kills B., who is behind a bush, A. not knowing that he was there. Here, although A. was doing an unlawful act, he was not guilty of culpable homicide, as he did not intend to kill B., or cause death by doing an act that he knew was likely to cause death.

It is a curious circumstance that almost the very case which was under the consideration of the coroner, was discussed by the Indian Law Commissioners, of whom Lord (then Mr.) Macaulay was president, in the report which they laid before the Governor-General of India in Council in the year 1837. Early in the progress of the Code it became necessary for the Commissioners to consider to what extent ought *omissions* which are known as likely to produce certain evil effects to be made punishable, and they concluded that some of these omissions ought to be, and some ought not to be, punished in the same manner in which acts are punished. The Commissioners say in their report:—

It will hardly be disputed that a gaoler who voluntarily causes the death of a prisoner by omitting to supply that prisoner with food, or a nurse who voluntarily causes the death of an infant entrusted to her care by omitting to take it out of a tub of water into which it has fallen, ought to be treated as guilty of murder. On the other hand, it will hardly be maintained that a man should be punished as a murderer because he omitted to relieve a beggar, even though there might be the clearest proof that the death of the beggar was the effect of this omission, and that the man who omitted to give the alms knew that the death of the beggar was likely to be the effect of the omission. It will hardly be maintained that a surgeon ought to be treated as a murderer for refusing to go from Calcutta to Meerut to perform an operation, although it should be absolutely certain that this surgeon was the only person in India who could perform it, and that if it were not performed, the person who required it would die. It is difficult to say whether a penal code which should put no omissions on the same footing with acts, or a penal code which should put all omissions on the same footing with acts, would produce consequences more absurd and revolting. There is no country in which either of these principles is adopted. Indeed, it is hard to conceive how, if either were adopted, society could be held together. It is plain, therefore, that a middle course must be taken. But it is not easy to determine what that middle course ought to be. The absurdity of the two extremes is obvious. But there are innumerable intermediate points; and wherever the line of demarcation may be drawn, it will, we fear, include some cases which we might wish to exempt, and will exempt some which we might wish to include.

The principle of the distinction appears to be founded on the association, with the omission, of such a duty on the part of the person guilty of the omission as the law can enforce or, at least, can recognise.

A New General Order in Bankruptcy has been issued. It merely prescribes the forms of the annual Returns to be made by the Registrars and other officers in pursuance of the Act of 1861.

THE LEICESTER MEETING.

The Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association will hold its annual meeting, at Leicester, on the 29th of September and the following day. The Leicester Law Society will entertain the members on the second day of meeting, and will make all the local arrangements for the conduct of business. The Council of the Association has appended to the circular announcing the meeting the following list of subjects suggested for papers, 1863:—

1. Courts of Conciliation. Lord Brougham's Bill.
2. Concentration of Courts and Offices.
3. Registration of Titles. Registration of Deeds. The Land Acts of last year.
4. The Accountant-General's Department in the Court of Chancery.
5. The Annual Certificate Duty.
6. Bankruptcy Reform. The Lord Chancellor's Act.
7. Professional Remuneration.
8. Legal Education. The Preliminary and Intermediate Examinations.
9. Fusion of Law and Equity.
10. Mining Leases.
11. Appointment of a Minister of Justice.
12. Offices of Executor and Trustee.
13. Partnership *en commandite*. Mr. Scholefield's Bill.
14. Registration of Firms.
15. Limited Companies.
16. Local Tribunals of Commerce and Councils of Prud'hommes.
17. Divorce Court.
18. Local Government Legislation.
19. Grand and Petty Juries. The Principle of Unanimity.
20. Law of Libel.
21. Judgments as Charges on Land. Mr. Hadfield's Bill.
22. Appeal in Criminal Cases.
23. Expurgation and Codification of the Statute Law, and the Improvement of the System of preparing Parliamentary Bills.
24. Security for Costs.
25. Execution of English Judgments in Scotland and Ireland, and *vice versâ*.
26. Laws and Customs relating to Public Meetings.
27. Laws relating to Prize of War.

As a rule, we have not much faith in the value of papers written by request, or of discussions upon subjects of a highly speculative or recondite character, such as some of those are which have been suggested for the exercitation of members. One paper written by a man who really wants to be heard upon a subject—who has something to say, and must say it—is worth a dozen laboured compositions accomplished under official pressure. It is, no doubt, desirable that an intimation should be given beforehand of the topics which are likely to come under discussion; and if the list of "subjects" were confined to this object, it would be useful. It would be impossible, however, to discuss fully, or with any advantage, more than three or four of the twenty-seven subjects suggested, and we think it will be a mistake if there is an attempt to cover anything like the extent of ground marked out by the Council. We recommend to the consideration of the members, "Courts of Conciliation," "The Annual Certificate Duty," and "The Registration of Firms," as subjects of an eminently practical character, the discussion of which may be highly serviceable.

If the Association desires to maintain its character for efficiency, and to discharge its most useful function as an agent both of town and country, it will take up with earnestness the agitation for obtaining the repeal of the onerous and obnoxious annual certificate duty. A mere petition to Parliment now and then, emanating from the officials of the Association, although stating that the body includes several hundred members, will not have much weight while the individual members themselves and their representatives in the House of Commons are silent. A burden of this kind will remain for ever—however grievous it may be—unless those who have to bear it cry out, not vicariously, but in their own proper persons. The first and main business of such a professional body as the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association is to organise its constituency for public action, in respect of professional grievances; and no profession ever had such a grievance to complain of as the attorneys and solicitors have in this annual poll tax, or extra income tax—for it may be regarded in either light. We expect, therefore, that the Leicester meeting will not be content with reading a "paper" on the subject, but that it will strike out a plan of *action*, such as may be expected to lead to definitive results. *Facts* and *suggestions* relative to the present incidence and operation of the tax will, of course, be valuable—for the information, not merely of the profession, but of Parliament, and the public generally. But what is really wanted is, not *data* to go upon — for of these we ourselves have from time to time exhibited abundance—but systematic and organised action throughout the whole profession. The numerous communications addressed to us from Ireland and Scotland, and the petitions to the House of Commons from both these countries, show that the Irish and Scotch solicitors are ready and willing to co-operate in the matter with their English brethren. They have, however, hitherto felt the chilling effects of isolation, and they have been discouraged by the absence of a common centre of action. During the past session we did all that lay in our power to supply the want; and, if necessary, next session we shall do as much in the same way. But this matter of the repeal of the annual certificate duty requires for its management something more than the agency and good offices of a professional journal, however numerously and widely supported it may be; and if no existing association will take it up with energy, it will be necessary to form an association for the special purpose. We do not think it desirable to increase the number of professional societies where it is possible to attain all that may be desired by the agency of existing ones; and therefore we should rather see the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association entering heartily upon this work than that a new society should be called into existence for the purpose of accomplishing it, and this, we have no doubt, will be the general feeling throughout the profession. We trust, then, that some practical step will be taken at the Leicester meeting, and that its deliberations on this point will be found to bear fruit in the coming session of Parliament. We hope to be able, before the day of meeting, to announce what papers will be forthcoming on the occasion, and also to give some further information as to what may be expected to take place.

RETURN OF COMPANIES' PARLIAMENTARY EXPENSES.

In a recent number we drew attention to the Report from the Select Committee on Private Bill Legislation, and subsequently acquainted our readers with the provisions of the new Clauses Consolidation Bills, brought in upon the committee's recommendation, and passed at the end of the session. With a view further to diminish the parliamentary expenses of companies, the committee has also recommended that, in place of the double hearing of contested cases by committees of each House of Parliament, an arrangement ought to be come to by the two Houses by which a single hearing might be made to serve the purpose; and that opposed bills, having passed through a committee of the Commons, should be dealt with as unopposed bills in the Lords, and *vice versâ*, each House, nevertheless, retaining the power of referring the bill to a committee. It is also proposed that, in private bill practice, a reduction be made in the fees of counsel and the charges of solicitors. The least fees now payable to a junior counsel before a committee are fifteen guineas upon the brief, and fifteen guineas a day —ten of these being in the nature of a refresher, and five for consultation. Solicitors receive five guineas a day for attendance, but their principal profit arises from a charge of sixpence per folio for copies of the minutes of evidence beyond the twopence which they pay to the law stationer. The committee has resolved—

"That, independently of the fees marked on the briefs when delivered to counsel, no further or other fees shall be allowed on taxation than five guineas a day as a refresher for attendance, and two guineas a day for consultation.

"That the payment of solicitors by means of fees, or copies of minutes of evidence and other documents, which entail no labour upon them, is improper, and ought to be abolished.

"That it is expedient that the minutes of evidence be printed."

Further resolutions have been agreed to by the committee for a reduction of the House fees, the diminution of advertisements, and for a reference, with the consent of all parties promoting and opposing, of private bills, either wholly or in respect of particular clauses, to the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means; so that the chairman, with members to be appointed in like manner as members of the committee of unopposed bills, should be empowered to hear the parties promoting and opposing, and to report to the House.

Our object in again referring to this committee, is to notice a return, which was made at the end of the session on Colonel Wilson Patten's motion, and has just been printed. It gives the amount of the expenses incurred by the railway, gas, and water companies, in promoting or opposing bills before Parliament in the years 1855–61, specifying the amounts incurred in prosecuting or opposing bills. For the purpose of furnishing the required particulars, the railway department of the Board of Trade received replies from 283 railway companies; but from 70 other companies the Board had not, up to the 21st ult., received any return, notwithstanding that my Lords caused a special "reminder" to be sent to every defaulting company. By the Act for regulating railways (3 & 4 Vict. c. 97), those companies are bound to deliver returns to the Board of Trade, of traffic and accidents, and tables of tolls, rates, and charges; and by the Act of the 5 & 6 Vict. c. 55, further provision is made for returns of serious accidents; but, so far as we are aware, there is no legal obligation on companies to supply the Board with the amounts of their solicitors' Parliamentary bills. But it is vain to resist when a short Act can create the obligation. Reticence unexplained in such a case does not look well. The general legal expenses each year of any company may readily be known from the reports at the meetings. In some cases, indeed, the companies have not distinguished the expenses called for; in other cases incomplete returns occur, from the circumstance that the accounts had not been rendered for the year 1861; in many of the companies no Parliamentary expense was incurred.

The following are some of the heavy expenses, in round numbers, of promoting and opposing bills; although, in proportion to capital, instances of lower figures might show results really more striking. The order is alphabetical. The Bedford and Cambridge Company spent in 1859, £9,000; and in 1860, £8,000. The Caledonian, in the years 1857–61 respectively, £9,000, £13,000, £18,000, £22,000, and £9,000; and in the whole seven years' period of 1855–61, £80,000. The

Charing Cross, in 1859–61, £7,000, £4,000, and £4,000. The Cleveland, in 1858, 1859, and 1861, £13,000, £9,000, and £10,000. The Colne Valley, in 1861, £9,000. The Cork and Macroom, in 1860 and 1861 together, £12,000. The Eastern Counties, in 1856, £9,000; in 1861, £28,000; total in the seven years, £47,000. East Suffolk, in 1856, £11,000. The Formartine and Buchan, in 1856–59 respectively, £8,000, £6,000, £10,000, and £6,000. The Great Northern, in 1858, 1860, and 1861, £10,000, £15,000, and £12,000; total in the seven years, £51,000, including the charges for watching bills. The Great Western, in 1855 and 1856, £12,000 and £11,000, almost entirely in opposing; in 1858 and 1860, £7,000 each; in 1861, £16,000 in promoting, and £24,000 in opposing; total in the seven years, £86,000. The Hereford, Hay, and Brecon, in 1860, £6,000. The Lancashire and Yorkshire, in 1858–60, respectively, £16,000, £15,000, and £10,000; in 1861, £24,000 in promoting, and £16,000 in opposing; total in the seven years, £87,000. The London and North Western, in 1855–57, respectively, £7,000, £8,000, and £9,000; in 1858–60, respectively, £21,000, £43,000, and £23,000 in promoting, and £16,000, £10,000, and £7,000 in opposing; the bills for 1861 not having been delivered, that year is omitted; total for the other six years, £147,000. The London and South Western, in 1855 and 1856, £7,000 each; in 1857 and 1858, £9,000 each; in 1859–61, respectively, £14,000, £8,000, and £6,000; with a total in the seven years of £63,000. The London, Brighton, and South Coast, in 1858 and 1859, £12,000 each; in 1860, £6,000 in promoting, and £12,000 in opposing; total in the seven years, £49,000. The London, Chatham, and Dover, 1857–59, respectively, £6,000, £18,000, and £8,000; in 1860, £48,000 in promoting, and £3,000 in opposing; in 1861, £37,000 in promoting; total, in the seven years, £126,000. The Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire, in 1858 and 1859, £8,000 and £7,000. The Maryport and Carlisle, in 1855, £8,000, divided between £1,500 in promoting, and £6,400 in opposing. The Merthyr, in 1859, £7,000. The Midland, in 1859–61, respectively, £13,000, £18,000, and £16,000. The Monkland, in 1857 and 1860, £8,000 and £11,000. The North British, in 1858 — 1861, respectively, £14,000, £13,000, £16,000, and £15,000. The North London, in 1861, £12,000. The North Staffordshire, in 1859, £7,000. North Western, in 1857, £8,000. The Penarth, in 1856, £7,000. The Scottish Central, in 1856, £12,000, in which sum was included the opposition to a bill for the same object by another company, but the amount could not be "condescended on." The Severn Valley, in 1855 and 1856, £6,000 each. The South Eastern, in 1855, 1858, and 1861, £6,000, £11,000, and £10,000. The South Wales, in the same years, £6,000, £6,000, and £10,000. The Stockton and Darlington, in 1858, £10,000. The Taff Vale, in 1857, £8,000. The Tewkesbury, in 1860, a clear £35,000 in promoting its bill. The West Midland, entirely in opposing bills, in 1855–57, respectively, £7,000, £14,000, and £22,000; in 1859, £6,000; total in the seven years, £64,000, opposition expenses.

Such figures, high as they are in the cases of some of the companies, yet probably do not convey an adequate idea of the grandeur of this part of the affairs of the railway kingdom. The great battle of the gauges, fought in 1846 and the following years, would have afforded a good illustration of the financial parliamentary history of companies. In the interest of shareholders, a return similar to the present, from the commencement of the North Western and the Great Western, might teach a little wisdom. But the present furnishes to some companies ground for a suggestive comparison of the year's outlay before committees with the amount of yearly income on ordinary capital. Thus, in the case of the Eastern Counties, the expense in 1861 is more than half of the whole fund available in 1863 for dividend on the ordinary shares.

The parliamentary expenses of the metropolitan and other gas companies and water companies, for the above-mentioned period, are also included in the return; but, except in a very few instances, the sums are not large. Some part of the difference is owing to the circumstance that in the case of these companies a great deal of the work in committees is done by the solicitors and Parliamentary agents themselves, without the aid of counsel.

This return is an unmistakable presage of the change impending over lawyers who practise before committees. After twenty years the House of Commons begins to regard railway legislation in its true character of a commercial necessity, instead of in its assumed character of a struggle between the joint-stock and the landed interests, to be carried on at an enormous adventitious cost to companies. Writing as lawyers, we cannot be expected to visit the system, which has now seen its palmiest days, with the same indignant comments as a shareholder would launch against it. But when we find the great companies which leave London on the west, the north-west, the north, the east, the south-east, the south, and the south-west, diverting, in the three years 1859–61, an aggregate sum of £400,000 from its regular channels, we shall not be taunted with disloyalty if we say, with the shareholder, *Sat prata biberunt.*

MR. J. B. PHEAR ON COSTS IN COMMON LAW COURTS.*

(*Concluded from page* 769.)

There is no check whatever provided by this Act against bringing Class 3 into the superior courts. If Class 2, or any resembling them, are brought there, no costs will be awarded unless the judge shall certify on the back of the record that it appeared to him at the trial that the cause of action was one for which a plaint could not have been entered in a county court, or that there was sufficient reason for bringing the action in the superior court, or unless an order of court or of a judge in chambers be obtained, under the provision of sect. 13. And, finally, those of Class 1, if brought in superior courts, and if only £20 or £5 be recovered, will also be awarded costs by an order under sect. 13, but not by a certificate. It must be added, that this Act expressly exempted judgment by default from deprivation of costs.

Whether the words "judgment by default," here used, are confined to actions of contract, or whether they extend to cases of tort, followed by an assessment of damages on a writ of inquiry, is not clear. However, as to judgments by default in actions of contract, this doubt is now of no importance, for if the amount of damages claimed, and therefore recovered, does not exceed £20, the plaintiff is, by sect. 30 of statute 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, deprived of costs, unless the court in which the action is brought or a judge otherwise directs; and it has been held† that the effect of this is to remove default in an action on contract from the above exemption.

Previously to this change, sect. 13 of statute 13 & 14 Vict. c. 61, which provided, in certain cases, a release by order of the court or judge from deprivation of costs, was repealed; and sect. 4, and statute 15 & 16 Vict. c. 54, substituted for it.

Thus we have in force four County Court Acts regulating costs in superior courts—one, the 9 & 10 Vict. c. 95, s. 129, giving costs as between attorney and client to a successful defendant; another in 13 & 14 Vict. c. 61, ss. 11 and 12, depriving a plaintiff of costs who obtains a verdict not exceeding £20 or £5 respectively, unless the judge gives a certain certificate; a third, the 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, s. 30, places judgment by default in the same position as the verdict just mentioned; and the fourth, the 15 & 16 Vict. c. 54, s. 4, enabling the plaintiff

* We have already stated that this very useful summary of a branch of law which is peculiarly interesting to attorneys, was contained in a paper read by Mr. Phear at a meeting of the Law Amendment Society.

† *Heard* v. *Eley*, 1 H. & N. 716.

in any of these cases to get his costs restored to him under certain circumstances, by obtaining an order from a court or judge to that effect.

Analogous to the County Court Acts is the 15 Vict. c. 77, which re-organised the Sheriff's Court in the city of London, and made it, in fact, the county court for a metropolitan district. Sects. 120, 121, and 122, in effect repeated the foregoing enactments of the County Court Acts relative to deprivation and restoration of costs in actions in the superior courts, merely placing the sheriff's court jurisdiction for that of the county court's, among the facts to be certified by the court or judge, and making the disqualifying verdict "less than," instead of "not exceeding," £20 and £5 respectively. But the 119th section, which appears to have found its way into the Act in a most unaccountable manner, introduced an additional restraint upon the plaintiff's right to costs. The only meaning that can be given to it (and even this construction, it may be remarked, renders part of its words superfluous) is, that if a plaintiff in superior courts, in any action on contract which might, with some exceptions, be brought in the city court (whose jurisdiction extends to £50, and is very comprehensive in regard to locality), recover £20, and not more than £50, he will be deprived of costs by the defendant entering a suggestion on the record, unless he obtains the certificate or order prescribed for the relief of the other cases.

Nor are these all the acts which profess to deal with limited verdicts, for the 23 & 24 Vict. c. 126, s. 34, enacts, that in any action for tort in the superior courts, where less than £5 is recovered, the plaintiff shall have no costs if the judge certifies that the action was not brought to try a right, and that the trespass was not wilful and malicious, and was not fit to be brought. It is remarkable that this section does not place a verdict of exactly £5 under the depriving power of the judge, but leaves it to the chance of escaping the forfeiting section of the County Court Act.

The confusion into which matters are thrown by these concurrent Acts of Parliament will be readily perceived from the annexed diagram.

What, after all, is the result aimed at by the voluminous mass of legislation and judicial decision which has been referred to, and imperfectly described? It is nothing more than this:—

1. To give the plaintiff or the defendant, or some of the individual defendants, should the action be brought against more persons than one, accordingly as they respectively succeed in the contest between them, the right to obtain the costs of suit from his opponent.

2. To distribute between the plaintiff and defendant the costs of the respective issues where several are raised by the pleadings to one cause of action, and neither party has succeeded upon them all.

3. To check vexatious litigation by prescribing some test for the purpose of sifting out of the superior courts all actions which either ought not to be brought at all, or might with complete justice have been decided in an inferior court.

In addition to the general legislation upon the subject of costs in the superior courts which I have attempted to describe, there are many Acts directed to the costs of action in special cases, such as actions on judgments, actions for infringement of patents, actions against persons for what they have done *pursuant* to a statute, actions for a debt of which affidavit has been filed under the Bankruptcy Act, actions brought by persons allowed to sue in *formâ pauperis*, &c. &c. The length to which this paper has already run prevents me from making more than a passing remark upon one or two of these.

It may be doubted whether the privilege of suing in *formâ pauperis* is now needed under the conditions of modern society. Scarcely a recent instance is known where suits maintained through its aid have not proved vexatious. Perhaps, however, its theoretical propriety may justify leaving the power of granting it in the discretion of the judges.

The favour shown to persons said to be acting in pursuance of a statute is generally misplaced, for in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the offender had no notion that he had been erring officially, or under special protection, until he learned the fact from his pleader, and the plaintiff is as often innocently trapped into a useless litigation. But setting aside these considerations, and also the difficulty of practically determining whether the circumstances under which the jury found for the plaintiff entitle the judge to give his certificate, there seems no better reason why, in cases of this class, the costs should be in the discretion of the judge than that they should be in the multitude of others, where the defendant commits the breach of contract or wrong without express malice. Either leave all costs to the decision of the court or judge, as is the practice in the Court of Chancery, or adopt a uniform mode of making them, with as few exceptions as possible, abide the event of the action.

The annexed draft of a bill will, better than any extended comments on the existing law, show how, I conceive, the matter might be advantageously dealt with by legislation, chiefly in the way of simplifying and consolidating statutes at present in operation.

It will be observed that I propose to return to the ancient principle of marking out one area only, as the space within which the judicial discretion is to be generally exercisable. In choosing the limit, I have been guided by the Legislature itself, which thought fit to make £20 the substitute for 40s. in determining the new county court jurisdiction. The only reason which I can imagine why tort should be allowed a lower limit in this respect than contracts, is the notion that more difficult questions of law as to liability of the parties may arise in them, notwithstanding the smallness of actual damage, than are involved in the construction of simple contracts. The truth of such a supposition I am not at all disposed to concede; and, on the other hand, I should urge the fact that the bulk of frivolous and vexatious actions—those termed essentially attorneys' actions—is to be found amongst those where the damages for a wrong are small. On the whole, therefore, I have come to the conclusion that the exigencies of practice do not, more than the impartiality of theory, recommend a distinction in this respect between actions on contracts and actions on torts.

1. The first section of the draft bill repeals all existing enactments on the subject (at least as far as I have been able to ascertain them), except those which apply to certain special forms of action such as a *scire fac.* to repeal letters patent, proceedings in error, &c.

2. The second gives costs to every plaintiff who obtains judgment.

3. The third gives costs to every defendant who obtains judgment.

4. The fourth deals with the case where there are two or more defendants.

5. The fifth distributes the costs of issues, where several are raised, to the same cause of action.

6. The sixth provides, however, that in any action on a judgment, and in any other action where the sum recovered does not exceed £20, the plaintiff shall not be entitled to costs if a certain certificate or order to the contrary be obtained.

7. The seventh also provides that in the case of an action on a debt, of which an affidavit has been filed in bankruptcy, the plaintiff shall not recover costs unless he be declared entitled to them by a certain rule or order; and moreover, that, in the absence of such rule or order, he shall be obliged to allow the defendant his costs of suit out of the damages.

There are many objections to this provision, but I have permitted it to appear here because it was advisedly left unrepealed by the last Bankruptcy Act so recently passed. If it be allowed to stand, I think it ought to be so worded

as to throw the burden of the certificate the other way, otherwise a suggestion on the roll will be needed.

8. The eighth preserves the privilege of suing in *formâ pauperis*.

9. The ninth interprets the words "action," "plaintiff," "defendant," "person," "judgment," "costs of suit," and in directing that the last shall be estimated and taxed as between *attorney and client*, probably introduces the greatest element of change contained in the bill. Why the successful litigant, when recovering his expenses, should not be permitted to obtain the actual sum to which they amount under legitimate taxation, I have never been able to understand.

10. The tenth empowers the judges from time to time to make rules for the more effectually carrying the bill into effect.

CLASSIFICATION OF ACTIONS IN THE SUPERIOR COURTS, WHERE THE RIGHT TO COSTS DEPENDS UPON THE SUM RECOVERED.

	Class of Cases.	Sum Recovered.	
A	City Small Debts Act	£20 and not exceeding £50	No costs, if followed by suggestion, unless there be certificate or order.
B	County Court Act	Not more than £20	No costs unless by certificate or order.
C	City Small Debts Act	Less than £20	No costs unless by certificate or order.
D	County Court Act	Not more than £5	No costs unless by certificate or order.
E	City Small Debts Act	Less than £5	No costs unless by certificate or order.
F embracing both D. & E.	Common Law Procedure Act, 1860	Less than £5	No costs if judge certifies. [notice.
G	Lord Denman's Act, sect. 3	Less than forty shillings	Full costs if allowed by suggestion of
H	Lord Denman's Act	Less than forty shillings	No costs unless judge certifies.
I	Ditto, together with Slander Act	Less than forty shillings	No costs unless judge certifies, and then no more than damages.
K	Act of Elizabeth	Less than forty shillings	All costs unless judge certifies.

Of course the classes A, B, C, and D are not all exclusive of each other, nor is the sum mentioned as the limit always to be recovered by verdict.

EQUITY.

HUSBAND AND WIFE—DESERTION—JUDICIAL SEPARATION—PAYMENT OF FUND TO WIFE.—A married woman having been deserted by her husband two days after the marriage, obtained a judicial separation, with costs against him. After the desertion she was entirely supported by a sister. Upon the petition of the wife and sister the arrears of an annuity to which the former was entitled were ordered to be paid to the latter, to the exclusion of the husband.—*Re Ford*, M.R., 11 W. R. 845.

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—COSTS—TAKING UP COPYHOLDS—THIRD WITNESS DEVISEE.—Where a testator has not directed a conversion of his property, so as to form a mixed fund, the costs of administering his estate, and of appeals on questions of construction, &c., are chargeable upon the personal estate, and if there is a deficiency, then on the real estate in aid.

Where there is a devise in fee with an executory gift over of copyholds, the taking-up is payable by the devisee in the absence of any custom.

Where a devisee puts his name to a second clause of attestation to a will as a third witness at the request of another person, but objected to by the testator, that is an attestation of the will within the 15th section of the Wills Act, and the interest of such person goes to the heir at law.—*Randfield* v. *Randfield*, V.C.K., 11 W. R. 847.

SALE OF CHAPEL LANDS—BILSTON ACT—PAYMENT BY INSTALMENTS.—Under the 7 & 8 Vict. c. xix., which is identical with the Bilston Act (42 Geo. 3, c. cxvii.), the Court will direct the payment of the interest of purchase-money for church lands by instalments to the incumbent, the costs to come out of the corpus.—*Re Willenhall Chapel of Ease*, V.C.K., 11 W. R. 850.

SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE—INJUNCTION—NEGATIVE RELIEF—CONTRACT FOR WORKS—RAILWAY COMPANY.—The directors of a railway company, by their duly authorised agent, entered into a contract with B., a railway contractor, for the construction of their line at a certain price, payable in shares and debentures of the company. The directors subsequently repudiated the contract (denying the authority of their agent), and entered into an agreement by which another railway company was to undertake the construction of the line. B. filed his bill to obtain specific performance of his contract, and moved to restrain the directors from parting with the shares which would have become applicable for his payment. Held, that the contract could not be severed, and that as the positive relief of enforcing specific performance of the contract for construction of the line could not be granted, the defendants could not be negatively restrained from parting with the shares (forming the consideration to B.) in violation of the contract; especially as in the event of B. failing in his contract the company could not be restored to their original position.—*Peto* v. *The B. U. and T. W. R. Co.*, V.C.W., 11 W. R. 874.

Practice.

APPEAL—STAYING PROCEEDINGS—COSTS.—Where application is made to stay proceedings under a decree pending an appeal to the House of Lords, the costs of the application must be paid by the applicant.—*Topham* v. *The Duke of Portland*, L.J., 11 W. R. 813.

SERVICE OF PROCESS OUT OF JURISDICTION.—In a creditor's suit to administer the personal estate of the deceased debtor, the defendant, the executrix, being resident out of the jurisdiction, an order was obtained to serve the bill upon her abroad, and the bill was served accordingly. A motion was thereupon made on behalf of the defendant to discharge this order for irregularity, on the ground that the suit did not relate to any of the matters mentioned in the statutes 2 Will. 4, c. 33, and 4 & 5 Will 4, c. 82, and that, according to the decision of the Lord Chancellor, in *Cookney* v. *Anderson*, 11 W. R. 628, the 10th General Order, r. 7, providing for service on defendants abroad, only applied to such suits. The bill was silent as to the nature of the property of the deceased, but in opposition to the motion the plaintiff filed an affidavit by which it appeared that at the time of the debtor's decease he was entitled to twenty shares in the Aldershot Manure Company.

Held, that as a part of the debtor's estate consisted of "shares in a public company," which in the course of the suit would be operated upon by the decree of the Court, the case was within the latter statute, and that the order for service abroad was regular.

A defendant may move to discharge an order for ser-

vice on him abroad, on the ground of irregularity, without filing any affidavit in support of such motion.—*O. M. National Prov. and Inv. Assn.* v. *Carstairs*, M.R., 11 W. R. 866.

PLEA AND ANSWER.—Where a defendant, to avoid putting in an account, pleads to all the relief and some of the discovery sought, if the plaintiff may be entitled to some relief which the plea does not specifically meet, it covers too much, and will be simply overruled in the usual form.—*Hewitt* v. *Hewitt*, V.C.K., 11 W. R. 849.

PETITION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BILL OF REVIEW—ORDER UNDER TRUSTEE RELIEF ACT.—On a petition for leave to file a bill of review, the Court must be satisfied that the facts are recently discovered, and that there are grounds for a claim. For this purpose an order under the Trustee Relief Act stands on the same footing as a decree in a suit.—*Re Smyth and Arnold's Estates*, V.C.K., 11 W. R. 850.

SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER—DEATH OF SOLE PLAINTIFF WHOSE EXECUTORS REFUSE TO REVIVE.—After replication the sole plaintiff dies intestate as to real estate, but leaving personalty by will, and his executors refuse to revive. The defendant then moves to dismiss unless the bill is revived within a limited period, and the executors apply for a supplemental order under 15 & 16 Vict. c. 86, first to the registrar, as of course, and then to the Court. The application being refused, the executors then ask leave to file an original bill in the nature of a supplemental bill, and annex it to the original bill.

Held, that the Court cannot give such leave.—*Wright* v. *Wilkin*, V.C.K., 11 W. R. 851.

COSTS—DISCLAIMING DEFENDANT—MOTION TO DISMISS.—A plaintiff in a foreclosure suit moved to dismiss the bill without costs, against a defendant, a judgment creditor, who had disclaimed subsequently to the institution of the suit. The Court refused to make any order as to costs up to and including the disclaimer, but ordered those subsequent thereto to be paid by the plaintiff.—*Gowing* v. *Mowberry*, V.C.S., 11 W. R. 851.

TIME TO ANSWER—PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS BY PLAINTIFF.—A bill for an account against an agent referred to accounts, and alleged inaccuracies and fraud. The Court refused an application for time to answer until the plaintiff had produced and given copies of the accounts to defendant.—*Turner* v. *Burkenshaw*, V.C.S., 11 W. R. 851.

MOTION TO REMOVE NEXT FRIEND, GUARDIAN, AND RECEIVER.—The next friend of an infant having been also appointed by the Court general guardian and receiver, a motion is made by the infant to remove him from all those offices, the notice of motion being signed by a solicitor.—Held, on the authority of *Furtado* v. *Furtado*, 6 Jur. O. S. 228, that although a next friend may be removed by a notice of motion signed by the solicitor, a guardian and receiver cannot; and motion refused, with leave to amend by putting the name of a next friend *pro hac.*—*Cox* v. *Wright*, V.C.K., 11 W. R. 870.

6TH RULE OF 10TH CONSOLIDATED ORDER—EXTENSION OF THE FOURTEEN DAYS.—Where an order has been obtained under the 6th rule of the 10th Consolidated Order to advertise, and it is found impossible to do so within the fourteen days, the Court will extend the time.—*Dicker* v. *Clarke*, V.C.K., 11 W. R. 870.

ACCOUNTS—PROOF OF PAYMENT.—A trustee managed an estate through the agency of a bailiff, who kept a book in which he entered disbursements, but obtained no receipts. The trustee also kept books in his own handwriting. On bill for an account being filed against the trustee,—Held, that the books, verified by affidavit of the trustee might be received as evidence of disbursement.—*Cookes* v. *Cookes*, V.C.S., 11 W. R. 871.

COMMON LAW.

HOME CIRCUIT.—CROYDON.

(Before Baron BRAMWELL and a Special Jury.)

Aug. 18.—*Grelle and Another* v. *Levi.*—This was an action to recover the balance of a sum of money that had been recovered by the defendant, Edward Lawrence Levi, who is an attorney carrying on business in Henrietta-street, Covent-garden, from a person named Wilhelms.

The defendant put several pleas upon the record, but the most material one was a plea which alleged that the plaintiffs had entered into an agreement in the empire of France by which the defendant was entitled to retain the amount that was sought to be recovered. The plaintiffs denied by their replication that any such agreement had been entered into.

Mr. *M. Chambers*, Q.C., Mr. *C. Pollock*, and Mr. *Kelly* were counsel for the plaintiffs; Mr. *Hawkins*, Q.C., *Serjeant Ballantine*, and Mr. *Prentice* were for the defendant.

This case was connected with an action tried at a former period of the assize, in which it was sought to be established that Wilhelms was a partner in the firm of Samson & Co., who carried on business as merchants in Bucklersbury, and who had failed, and in which action the plaintiffs recovered a verdict. It appeared that the present plaintiffs carry on business at Paris, under the firm of Grelle & Frezuxsen, as silk merchants, and Samson & Co., who were bankrupts—Ellis, one of the partners, having altogether disappeared—owed them about £800. It appeared that in this state of things the defendant, Mr Levi, wrote to the plaintiffs and informed them that he believed he could assist them in recovering the debt that was due to them by Wilhelms; and the result of this was, that an interview took place, and the defendant commenced an action against Wilhelms, which was ultimately settled by Mr. Wilhelms paying £500 on account of the debt, and £170 costs, which account was paid to the defendant. The case on the part of the plaintiffs was, that the defendant only handed over £300 to the plaintiffs, and the present action was brought to recover the balance of the sum he had received from Mr. Wilhelms.

Mr. *Alfred Jones*, the solicitor who had acted for Mr. Wilhelms, was called to prove the circumstances connected with the settlement of the action.

In cross-examination, Mr. Jones said that his own costs in the action were £130, and he had not delivered any briefs.

Mr. Chambers said this was all the evidence he proposed to give at present.

Mr. *Hawkins* then addressed the jury for the defendant, and he said that the answer he was instructed to make to the plaintiffs' claim was that they had entered into an agreement with the defendant that if he recovered the money for them he should have half of the sum that was obtained, and under this agreement and some subsequent arrangements that were made the defendant claimed to be entitled to hold the balance, and he had, in point of fact, paid a larger sum than the plaintiffs were entitled to, as his costs were £240, while he only received £170. He said that it was undoubtedly true that the defendant had offered his services to the plaintiffs to recover this debt for them, and he should not attempt to justify such a proceeding on the part of an attorney; but it must at the same time be borne in mind that such a proceeding was no infringement of the law, and that it had no doubt been resorted to by many other attorneys, although it was not a practice which courts of justice, or persons connected with the legal profession, could regard favourably. The fact was, he believed, however, that Messrs. Grelle & Co. were not in a position at the time to have made the advances that were necessary to carry on the proceedings against Mr. Wilhelms, and the money had no doubt been recovered through the exertions of Mr. Levi.

The learned counsel then read the agreement to which he referred, the terms of which were that the plaintiffs were not to be called upon to furnish any funds, or to be in any way liable for costs that might be incurred in bringing the action against Wilhelms, but that Mr. Levi was to find all the money, and if he was ultimately unsuccessful in the cause he was to bear the loss, and the plaintiffs were not to be in any way responsible If, on the other hand, he succeeded in recovering from Wilhelms, the agreement stated that he was to have half the amount so recovered. The learned counsel went on to say that the defendant had acted strictly up to the terms of this agreement, and the £300 was paid to the plaintiffs, and he received it upon the full understanding that this was the whole amount they were entitled to. The jury, he said, had nothing to do with the propriety or impropriety of the course that had been taken

by the defendant, and all they were called to do was to decide the legal rights of the parties.

Mr. E. L. Levi, the defendant, was then examined in support of his defence.

Some additional evidence having been adduced on behalf of the plaintiffs,

Mr. *Hawkins* addressed the jury upon it, and

Mr. *Chambers* having replied upon the whole case,

Mr. Baron BRAMWELL proceeded to sum up. He said there could be no doubt, from the admission of the plaintiffs, that the agreement relied upon by the defendant had been made by them; and, although it was one which any respectable attorney would have been shocked at being a party to, still he felt that he must direct them that, in point of law, as it had been made in France, it was binding, and the defendant was entitled to a verdict upon it if they should be of opinion that it was made under the circumstances he had represented. He was also of opinion that if the defendant, the moment he received the money, had acted in a straightforward manner, and had handed over half of it to the plaintiffs according to the terms of the agreement, it would have been an answer to the present action. He had not, however, done so, and he should therefore tell them that if they believed he had induced the plaintiffs to enter into the fresh engagement and accept the £300, by the representation that he had only received £340, and had deceived them in this respect at the time the fresh agreement was entered into, such a proceeding on his part amounted to fraud, and that thereby the agreement was cancelled and the plaintiffs were entitled to recover. The learned judge, in the course of some further observations, said that the case was altogether certainly a very mournful one. It appeared to have had its origin in the roguery of Samson & Co., and to have been tainted with that vice to the end.

The jury, after a short deliberation, said they were of opinion that the plaintiffs had been induced to enter into the new agreement by the misrepresentations of the defendant. They also said they were of opinion that none of the sums claimed in the set-off had been paid.

Baron BRAMWELL expressed his opinion that upon this finding he ought to direct a verdict to be entered for the plaintiffs; but Mr. Hawkins submitted that upon the count in the declaration for money had and received the defendant was, at all events, entitled to a verdict.

Some discussion took place between the Court and the learned counsel on both sides with reference to the form in which the verdict should be entered, and eventually his Lordship directed that a verdict should be entered for the defendant, but leave was given to the plaintiffs to move for a verdict to be entered in their favour, with nominal damages, or in the discretion of the Court, for the whole amount that had been paid by Wilhelms, less the costs of the defendant on the original proceedings, and the £300 which had been already paid.

PARISH LAW.

PAUPER LUNATIC.—In calculating the number of years necessary to confer on the husband of a lunatic wife the status of irremovability in a given parish, the period during which she has been maintained in the county lunatic asylum at the expense of that parish must be deducted, such maintenance being "relief to the husband" within the meaning of 9 & 10 Vict. c. 66, s. 1.—*Reg.* v. *The Churchwardens of St. Geo. Bloomsbry*, Q. B., 11 W.R. 801.

POOR LAW—UNION—APPORTIONMENT OF EXPENSES.—The provisions of section 9 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 55, which enact that the parishes comprised in any union formed under 4 & 5 Will. 4, c. 76, shall contribute to the common fund thereof in proportion to the annual rateable value of the lands, &c., respectively assessable to the poor laws, extends to unions in which the several parishes have agreed, under the provisions of section 38 of that Act, that they shall be considered as one parish for the purposes of settlement, as well as to all other unions constituted under the provisions of that Act.—*Reg.* v. *Clothrop*, Q. B., 11 W. R. 826.

POOR REMOVAL—BREAK OF RESIDENCE.—Order of removal: the pauper went to Cuba under a contract of service for three years, leaving his wife and family resident in the parish of W. At the end of two years and a-half he returned to his wife and family in the parish of W., and resided with them until the order of removal was made. His wife and family, at the time of the order of removal, had resided more than five years in the parish of W., in a house provided for them by the pauper, and the pauper had resided there with them except during the above-mentioned period of his service in Cuba. Held, that the above facts constituted a break in the residence, and that the pauper and his family had not acquired a *status* of irremovability in the parish of W.—*The Chwdns. of Wellington* v. *The Chwdns. of Whitechurch*, Q. B., 11 W. R. 828.

POOR LAW—EXTRA-PAROCHIAL PLACE—CONTRIBUTION TO FUND OF UNION.—Under 20 Vict. c. 19, s. 1, the justices appointed an overseer for the parish of S., an extra-parochial place, which had never before, nor has it since that time, had any poor, and no rate has been made since it became a parish. The Poor Law Commissioners afterwards made an order adding it to the H. union; and after the passing of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 55, the justices made an order upon it for contribution to the common fund of the union. Held, that though before the passing of the last-mentioned Act the parish of S. could not have been called upon to contribute to the common fund, it was rightly included in the union; and that after the passing of that Act it became liable to contribute in proportion to its rateable value.—*Overseers of Staple Inn, App.*, v. *Bd. of Guar. of Holborn Union, Resp.*, Ex., 11 W. R. 838.

BANKRUPTCY LAW.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Commissioner FANE.)

Aug. 19.—*In re Johnson.*—The bankrupt was an attorney carrying on business at Grecian Chambers, Temple, Marlborough-street, and elsewhere, and he now applied for his release from custody, having been in prison for eleven days.

Mr. *Dowse* opposed on the ground of a vexatious defence to an action brought against the bankrupt by his clerk for arrears of salary amounting to £102. The learned counsel said that the defendant, who had not a shadow of defence to the action, had pleaded several pleas, including "never indebted," "set-off," and "payment." At the reference before the Master he did not appear, and in the result the plaintiff was put to considerable unnecessary expense.

The bankrupt's excuse was that he was summoned to Bow-street police court on the morning of the reference, and was unable to attend before the Master.

The Commissioner held, however, that the bankrupt's conduct had been of a most vexatious nature, and said he would not release him until he had been three months in prison.

Application refused.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

THE LATE SIR CRESSWELL CRESSWELL.

In your capital notice of the late Sir Cresswell Cresswell, in the *Solicitors' Journal* of the 8th inst., you relate the well-known retort of Edwin James as one of the few anecdotes of successful retorts to that eminent, but proverbially uncourteous judge. There is another story told to this day among the benchers, for example, after dinner, when wine and good stories go round the table hand in hand, which I have always thought is even better as an example of the art of what is now called "shutting-up," than the one you quote. It runs as follows:—Sir Cresswell, then Mr. Cresswell, was arguing a case before a common law court—I forget which—of which Mr. Justice Maule was a member, and he was making use of all that scorn of those he was addressing, and thorough belief in himself, for which he was so distinguished, when Maule, J., interrupted him something after this fashion—"Now, Mr. Cresswell, you really *must* excuse my breaking the thread of your very admirable argument; but my brothers and I have noticed your tone towards us for the last hour or more with the greatest pain. We freely acknowledge the supreme advantage you have over us in legal talent and acumen; but you really *should* remem-

ber that we are, at all events, *vertebrated* animals, and you have been addressing us as God Almighty would four black beetles." Oldsters, who were present at the time, say that even Cresswell was abashed. LL. D.

August 18.

Stamp Duties.

A., some years ago, sold part of an estate to B., and another part to C., giving separate conveyances containing absolute covenants for production of title-deeds. A. is now conveying the rest of the property to D., who wishes to have the title-deeds, and B. and C. will release A. from his existing covenant. Will the stamp on the new deeds of covenant from D. to B. and C. be 10s. or £1 15s., there being no "*sale*" between the persons who will be *parties* to the new deed of covenant? See the schedule to 13 & 14 Vict. c. 97, or p. 8 of Stroud's new and very useful "Conveyancers' Stamp Duties."

August 18. S. S.

Status of Managing Clerks.

I have read your correspondent J. B.'s letter in your publication of the 8th inst., and I think the managing clerks in the profession are much indebted to him for his suggestion that some active measures should be taken to obtain an alteration in the rules as to the preliminary examination; and I should be glad if your correspondent would allow me to co-operate with him in any proceedings he may adopt.

The injustice of the regulation as regards managing clerks of ten years' standing is great; for although the examination would not be much, perhaps, to a youth fresh from school, yet to one whose whole time has been occupied for the last fifteen or twenty years in the arduous duties of a solicitor's office (frequently having the entire responsibility of the office on his shoulders), it is a task of great difficulty.

Imagine, the hardworking clerk, whose mind has been on the rack from morn till night, going home to his family, and, instead of seeking to divest his mind from business thoughts or mental exertion, having to pore over a Latin grammar, translate exercises, dive into history, con over a map of Europe, get entangled in a labyrinth of figures, and enveloped in a mass of subjects, none of which does he require in the pursuit of his profession. Surely, the Legislature never intended to be party to such a state of things, especially as by a previous Act of Parliament it had placed the clerk who had been *bonâ fide* engaged in the transaction of business in a solicitor's office for ten years in the same position as the man who has taken his degree at college, and allowing him to be articled for three years instead of five, thus showing the evident justice of exempting the ten-year man as well as the degree man from the preliminary (not the legal) examination. The only object of the regulation seems to be to keep out of the profession those best fitted by experience to enter it. As a class, managing clerks are educated men, but they have not the time to study subjects they must have forgotten, and especially they have not the time to make themselves proficient in a difficult language like Latin; and I agree with your correspondent that it is ridiculous to compel them to pass such an examination as the preliminary examination before allowing them to be articled. A Managing Clerk.

Gray's-inn, Aug. 20.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. George James Andrews, of Dorchester, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the acknowledgments of deeds by married women, for the county of Dorset.

Mr. Edward Walmisley, of No. 25, Abingdon-street, Westminster, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the acknowledgments of deeds by married women, for the county of Middlesex, and for the city and liberties of Westminster, and the city of London.

Mr. Edward Brown Fiske, of Beccles, Suffolk, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the acknowledgments of deeds by married women, for the counties of Suffolk and Norfolk.

The following legal appointments have been made in Upper Canada, viz.:—The Hon. Archibald McLean, late chief justice of Upper Canada, to be presiding judge of the Court of Error and Appeal, in the room and stead of the Hon. Sir John Beverley Robinson, Bart., C.B., deceased; the Hon. William Henry Draper, C.B., chief justice of the Court of Common Pleas in Upper Canada, to be chief justice of Upper Canada, in the room and stead of the Hon. Archibald McLean, resigned; the Hon. William Buell Richards, one of her Majesty's justices of the Court of Common Pleas in Upper Canada, to be chief justice of the said Court of Common Pleas, in the room and stead of the Hon. William Henry Draper, C.B., resigned; the Hon. John Wilson, Q.C., to be one of her Majesty's justices of the Court of Common Pleas in Upper Canada; Mr. Martin O'Gara, barrister-at-law, to be police magistrate for the city of Ottowa, in the room of John B. Lewis, Esq., resigned.

COLONIAL TRIBUNALS & JURISPRUDENCE.

INDIA.

A case of some interest to the missionary world, as well as of some importance in law, has been decided by Sir Mordaunt Wells, in the Bengal High Court. Hemnath Bose, a lad aged fifteen years two months and nine days, a pupil of a purely Hindoo school, was led to inquire into the truth of Christianity by some fellow-students, and applied to a native minister in connection with the Free Kirk Mission, of which the Rev. Dr. Duff is the head. He insisted on leaving his father's house and residing in the mission-house, but was thrice refused admission, and told to study the New Testament. At last he returned, asserting that he had done so, but his father put him under restraint. He showed great earnestness and importunity, and only then was admitted. As he was a few months under sixteen years of age, when he might be his own master, his father obtained a writ of *habeas corpus* from the High Court, returnable in twenty-four hours. Dr. Duff and the native missionary received it in the afternoon, and had to appear next morning, so that no time was given for counsel to set up a proper defence. The lad was produced in court. It was admitted that, so far from being detained against his will, his father had failed to induce him to leave; but Sir M. Wells declined to examine him so as to ascertain his intelligence, and denouncing missions and missionaries, he ordered the boy to go with his father. Some of our best legal authorities here consider Sir M. Wells' law altogether wrong. He decided entirely according to English precedents, and a stray judgment by Sir E. Perry, when judge in Bombay, none of which were strictly applicable to this case. The missionaries justify their action in the matter under the only precedents applicable—one in which Sir Lawrence Peel, when Chief Justice in Calcutta in 1847, allowed a youth under sixteen to go to the missionaries because he was satisfied as to his "discretion," and other two in which the Madras judges made over a girl of twelve and a youth under sixteen to the missionaries for the same reason. In India the Penal Code fixes fourteen as the age up to which it is criminal to entice away a youth; the religious ceremonies of the Hindoos allow a child to choose its guardian idol at an earlier age; and nothing is more common than to see a girl a mother at eleven, and a boy a father at twelve years of age. There was no question that, as against Dr. Duff, the father had a right to his son's body; but the question is, what is the son's right? It is stated that this case must result in definite action on the part of the Legislature, and that it will not be allowed to rest where it is.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

The Bishop of Cape Town has cited Bishop Colenso to appear before him on the 17th of November next.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The Annual Report of the Council.

This report, dated the 30th of June last, has just been issued. The Council, after noticing the changes made in the law since the publication of the last report, refer shortly to some of the measures which have been introduced into Parliament in the last session, having especial relation to matters in which attorneys and solicitors are concerned or interested and which have already appeared or received notice in these columns. The Council then notice some of the principal events or subjects that have occurred, or have been attended to by the Council, having reference to the well-being of the profession, or the interests of the society; among which are the following:—

Concentration of the Courts.

The subject of the concentration of the several courts is one

to which the Council have, for many years past, given their earnest and careful attention, as they are convinced that such concentration will tend much to the convenience of the legal profession at large, while it will be a most advantageous change for all branches of the public who at any time have occasion to resort to the public tribunals of the metropolis.

It will be remembered that the Courts of Justice Building (Money) Bill, which the Council had, during the year 1861, and the early part of 1862, matured with much care and attention, was negatived by the House of Commons on the second reading, on the 10th of April, 1862, by a majority of only two; and the other bill (for acquiring a site, and for erecting the building itself), for which the Parliamentary notices had been given for the session of 1862, was then necessarily allowed to drop.

The Council, at the proper time, before the commencement of the present session, urged on Government the propriety of renewing the Parliamentary notices, in order that the bill for acquiring a site might be again introduced into Parliament. It is to be regretted that Government failed to take the necessary steps.

With the view, however, of advancing this important matter the Council have had numerous interviews with the proper authorities, and eventually the Chief Commissioner of Works has given notice, in this present session, of his intention to bring in a bill to supply means towards defraying the expenses of providing courts of justice, and offices to be connected therewith; and the Council are waiting with attention the action upon such notice.

The Council will not relax in their endeavours to promote this much-needed improvement, and they trust that, before a very much greater lapse of time, their efforts will meet with success.

Chancery Funds Commission.

The Council informed the general body of members last year, that they had submitted to the Royal Commissioners various recommendations with reference to the business transacted in the Accountant-General's department.

Among other suggestions, the Council recommended that some arrangement should be made by means of which suitors might receive a moderate rate of interest on uninvested cash deposited in Court for a certain period, and the Council expressed their opinion that 2 per cent. would be a reasonable and proper rate of interest to allow to the suitors on all moneys so deposited.

Since the last general meeting the Council have been in communication with the Royal Commissioners, the result of which was, that, with the assistance of several solicitors of extensive practice in the Court of Chancery, the Council, in reply to the inquiries of the Royal Commissioners, were enabled to inform them that, in their opinion, if a deposit account were established, with an allowance of interest at 2 per cent. on all sums remaining on that account for three months or upwards, nearly one-half of the moneys paid into Court and invested, and which have been distributed within two or three years from the date of investment, would have been placed upon such deposit account. The Council deemed it right to mention that, although their opinion was based on examination of solicitors' books and papers relating to suits in which those solicitors had been engaged, and necessarily to some extent conjectural, they nevertheless believed it to be a close approximation to the truth.

The Several Examinations.

Although the examinations previous to articles, or to admission as attorneys and solicitors, cannot in strictness be said to be conducted by the Council, nor have the Council any express authority over them, those examinations having been established by, and being conducted under the orders of the judges, first made in the year 1836, and subsequently under the statutes 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, and 23 & 24 Vict. c. 127, yet the Council have had so large a share in originating, in 1836, the final examinations, and in suggesting and establishing the preliminary and intermediate examinations, in the years 1860, 1861, and 1862, that it seems fit that the Council should continue to give some account of their progress, as the watching over the examinations may now be considered a part of the duties which the profession expects the Council to perform.

The fact, too, of these examinations being chiefly carried on in the hall of the society, and of four members of the Council being appointed to act as examiners in each term, and the arrangements for them being entirely conducted by the society's secretary and officers, under the superintendence of the Council, affords additional reason for their being here adverted to.

The preliminary examinations, though established the latest appear to call for the first notice.

Since the date of the last annual report, four of these examinations have been held—viz., in August and October, 1862 and in February and May in the present year. These examinations have taken place under the direction of special examiners appointed by the judges on the suggestion of the Council, partly in the hall of the society, and partly in the several towns of Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Plymouth, Swansea, and York.

The result of these examinations is as follows:—In August 1862, seventy-four candidates passed, and twenty-two were postponed; in October, ninety were passed, and sixteen were postponed; in February, 1863, eighty passed, and fifteen were postponed; and in May last, eighty-nine passed, and twenty-one were postponed.

The Council believe that though the number of those rejected bears a large proportion to the number of candidates, yet that this was to be expected at the first establishment of the examination, and it is evidence of the want of such a system of preliminary examination; and they sincerely hope that the circumstance of this large proportion of the rejected will be attended with beneficial results, as inducing candidates in future years to come better prepared to enter this branch of the profession than was heretofore the case.

The intermediate examinations, established also by the recent orders of the judges, at the suggestion of the Council, take place in each term in the hall of the society, and are conducted by the masters of the several courts, and the members of the Council appointed by the judges for that purpose.

During the four last preceding Terms, 125 candidates have been examined—viz., twelve in Michaelmas Term, 1862; four in Hilary Term, 1863; thirty-five in Easter Term, and seventy-four in Trinity Term. Of these, 121 were passed, and four postponed.

This (the intermediate) examination only comes into operation by degrees, as the time increases from the date of the establishment of it by the original orders of 1861-1862. But it will be seen that it has gradually increased, and will soon attain an average maximum.

As the system is new, and, apparently, not thoroughly known to the profession, it may be useful that the course to be pursued should be shortly detailed here.

By the existing order, all persons under articles of clerkship executed after the 1st of January, 1861, must pass this examination, either in the term in which one-half of their term of service shall expire, or in one of the two terms next before, or one of the terms next after, one-half of the term of service.

A list of the elementary law works in which the candidates are examined in the following year is published by the examiners in the month of July in each year; and candidates are required to give one calendar month's notice before the commencement of the term in which they intend to be examined, and to leave their articles and answers to questions, as to due service, at the society's hall, seven clear days before such term. The notice should contain the candidate's name and address, and also the name and address of the attorney to whom he is articled.

The Council have much pleasure in stating that in Easter and Trinity Terms the examiners reported that seven gentlemen passed the intermediate examination with distinction. [Their names have already appeared in our columns.]

In the early part of the present year, it was thought desirable to effect some alterations and improvements (suggested by the working of the past year) in the several rules relating to the preliminary and intermediate examinations established in 1861-1862, in addition to the consolidation into one order of the three then existing orders.

One of the most important of these alterations was the exemption from preliminary examination, by the special examiners, of persons who had passed the matriculation examination (though not placed in the first division) at the universities of London or Dublin; the passing such examination in the first division already entitling the candidates to be articled for four years only. And another alteration of importance was a similar exemption in favour of the holders of first-class certificates of the College of Preceptors, the consideration of which latter exemption had been submitted to the Council by one of the chief justices, and, after inquiry, was approved by the Council, and such approval reported to the judges.

The other alterations recommended were chiefly in matters

of detail, connected with the conduct and arrangement of the examinations.

On the 31st of January last, the consolidating order, embracing the several alterations above mentioned, was signed by the judges, and is now in force; and prints of it have been transmitted by the Council to the members of this society, the provincial law societies, and the local examiners.

During the last four terms, 439 candidates have offered themselves for final examination previous to admission as attorneys and solicitors. Of these, 374 were passed, and sixty-five postponed; to eighteen candidates prizes have been awarded, some of which were presented by the hon. societies of Clifford's-Inn and Clement's-Inn, and others by this society; to thirty other candidates certificates of merit were granted; and in the cases of thirteen gentlemen who were above the age of twenty-six years, the examiners have reported favourably. [The names of these gentlemen have already appeared in our columns.]

A slight alteration as to this (final) examination has been effected, by an order of the judges made in Easter Term last, by which candidates are required to leave their articles of clerkship and assignments, if any, together with testimonials as to due service thereunder, at the hall of the society, within *fourteen* days immediately preceding the *first* day of the term in which they intend to be examined.

While treating on the subject of articled clerks, it may be useful to mention a regulation sometimes overlooked—viz., that by the 7th section of the 23 & 24 Vict. c. 127, articles of clerkship and assignments are to be produced to and entered by the registrar of attorneys within *three months after enrolment*, otherwise the service of the clerk will be reckoned from the date of such production and entry, unless one of the courts or a judge shall otherwise order.

(To be continued.)

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

MEETINGS.

BELFAST AND NORTHERN COUNTIES RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 10th inst., a dividend at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

CORK AND LIMERICK DIRECT RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 10th inst., a dividend at the rate of £3 per cent. per annum, free of income-tax, was declared for the past half-year.

GREAT WESTERN AND BRENTFORD RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 19th inst., a dividend at the rate of £2 per cent. per annum on the ordinary shares of the company was declared for the past half-year.

HULL AND SELBY RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 14th inst., a dividend of £2 9s. 6d. per whole or £50 share, and in a like proportion for the half and quarter shares, was declared for the past half-year.

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 19th inst., a dividend at the rate of 4 per cent. on the ordinary stock of the company was declared for the past half-year.

LYNN AND HUNSTANTON RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 15th inst., a dividend at the rate of £3 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

NORTH-EASTERN RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 14th inst., the following dividends, less income-tax, were declared for the half-year ending the 30th of June:—Upon the amount paid upon the ordinary stock and shares in the Berwick capital stock at the rate of 4½ per cent. per annum, and upon the Thirsk and Malton stock in the same capital stock at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum; upon the ordinary stock in the York capital stock at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum; upon the ordinary stock in the Leeds capital stock at the rate of 1¾ per annum; upon the ordinary stock in the Carlisle capital stock at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum; and upon the 4 per cent. preferential stock an equalizing dividend at the rate of 2 per cent. per annum; also, a dividend at the rate of 7½ per cent. per annum on the ordinary shares in the Darlington section.

NORTH LONDON RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 14th inst., a dividend at the rate of £6 per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

RHYMNEY RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 18th inst., a dividend at the rate of 2½ per cent. per annum was declared for the past half-year.

SALISBURY AND YEOVIL RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 14th inst., dividends at the rate of 5 per cent. on the preference stock, and at the rate of 4½ per cent. per annum on the ordinary stock, were declared for the past half-year.

SOUTH YORKSHIRE RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 15th inst., dividends at the rate of £5 per cent. upon the 4 per cent. guaranteed stock, and of 5 per cent. upon the ordinary stock, were declared for the past half-year.

ULSTER RAILWAY.

At the half-yearly meeting of this company, held on the 11th inst., a dividend at the rate of £5 per cent. per annum, on the ordinary shares of the company, was declared for the past half-year.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is a tribunal of which so little is commonly known, that a summary of its last year's work will be acceptable. The largest part of the business comes from India and the colonies. There were 51 appeals entered in the course of the year—21 of them from India, 13 from the colonies, 2 from the Channel Islands, 13 from the Admiralty Courts, and 2 from the Ecclesiastical Courts. 48 were heard and determined; and the judgment appealed from was affirmed in 23 instances, reversed in 21, varied in 4. Out of 19 cases from the colonies determined in the year, the judgment was affirmed in only 5 instances. Costs were given in 38 of the appeals; the taxed costs (on one side only) are stated to have averaged £267, but the tabular return indicates £336. The year closed with 94 appeals remaining for hearing, 48 of them from India. In the same year 11 applications were lodged for the extension or confirmation of letters patent; one was withdrawn, three were dismissed, one was granted.

The returns for last year relating to joint-stock companies winding-up in Chancery show that in the course of the year calls were made amounting to £1,024,496. It seems, however, that all this money did not come when it was called for; the official managers or liquidators only received £342,080 in the year. Their disbursements amounted to £31,889—viz., £16,148 for law expenses, £1,395 for auctioneers and accountants, and £14,346 for their own remuneration and expenses. The sum of £270,915 was paid to creditors in the shape of dividends. There were cases still pending last year in which the official manager or liquidator was appointed so long ago as 1849.

Mr. W. M. Bridger, the recorder of Chichester, and magistrate of Bradford-on-Avon, was accidentally killed on the evening of Wednesday, the 12th inst., in Regent-street. The deceased gentleman was crossing the entrance to Argyle-place, when he was knocked down by the horses of one of Chaplin & Horne's vans, the wheels of the van passing over his body. His death was instantaneous. A coroner's inquest was held on the body on Monday last, when the jury returned a verdict of "Accidental death."

It has been determined to proceed with the decorations of the Temple church as rapidly as possible during the long vacation; and Divine service will not be performed again there until Sunday, the 4th of October.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

PAIN—On Aug. 15, at 8, Phillimore-terrace, Kensington, the wife of Thomas Pain, Esq., Barrister, of a son.

PATERSON—On Aug. 13, at 23, Neville-terrace, Hornsey-road, the wife of W. J. Paterson, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

CREE—COFFEY—On Aug. 19, at St. George's Church, Dublin, George Cree, Lower Mount-street, Dublin, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, to Louisa Anna, only daughter of James Charles Coffey, Mountjoy-square, Esq., Chairman of the county of Westmeath.

TREVOR—WESTON—On Aug. 18, at St. Mary Abbott's, Kensington, Charles Cecil Trevor, of Lincoln's-inn, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, to Mary, daughter of James Weston, Esq., of Hyde-park-Gate.

WILBY—SKINNER—On Aug. 13, at Berswick Church, near Stafford, the Rev. Parkes Wilby, Curate of Petersham, Surrey, to Anna Cordelia, eldest daughter of Allan Maclean Skinner, Q.C., Judge of County Courts holden in South Staffordshire, and Recorder of Windsor.

DEATHS.

BRIDGER—On Aug. 12, of an accident in London, William Milton Bridger, Esq., of The Chantrey, Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts, J.P., Recorder of the City of Chichester.

FOOT—On Aug. 18, at 14, Upper Fitzwilliam-street, Dublin, Lundy Edward Foot, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, aged 72.

MARTIN—On Aug. 17, at 11, Kidbrooke-terrace, Blackheath, Emily Nancy Eastabrook, the wife of Thomas Martin, Esq., of 57, Cannon-street, London, Solicitor, aged 37.

STEVENS—On Aug. 15, at Harleyford-place, Kennington-park, William Stevens, Esq., Solicitor, of 6, Queen-street, Cheapside, in the 80th year of his age.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

August 13.—By Mr. Marsh.

Freehold printing ink works at Old Ford, Bow, with manufacturing buildings, two steam engines, machinery, and plant, foreman's residence, and five cottages, Nos. 1 to 5, Lechlade-place; also freehold premises, No. 7, Wine Office-court, Fleet-street, with all machinery, plant, &c. —Sold for £6,100.

Leasehold business premises, No. 214, Piccadilly.—Sold for £5,870.

Freehold manufacturing premises, situate in White Post-lane, Hackney, with all machinery, &c.—Sold for £3,000.

Leasehold improved rentals of £6 10s. per annum, secured on Nos. 13 & 14, Bryan-street, Caledonian-road; also a leasehold house, No. 15, Bryan-street, and a dwelling-house and manufacturing premises, No. 16, Bryan-street.—Sold for £600.

August 14.—By Messrs. Norton, Hoggart, & Trist.

Freehold, The Lampford Hall Estate, in the parishes of Great and New Lampford, Essex, comprising residence with gardens and pleasure grounds, the whole containing about 110 acres arable, meadow, and pasture land.—Sold for £50,000.

Freehold building land, at Hornsey, about 6 acres.—Sold for £3,800.

Freehold ground rent, £31 10s. per annum, secured upon Nos. 1 to 7, Leopold-place, Devonshire-street, Mile End.—Sold for £600.

Freehold ground rent, £3 15s. per annum, secured upon Nos. 8 and 9, Leopold-place.—Sold for £75.

Freehold ground rent, £10 per annum, secured upon Nos. 3 and 4, Charles-street.—Sold for £190.

Freehold ground rent, £20 per annum, secured upon Nos. 34 and 35, Charles-street, and 13, 14, and 15, Anne-street.—Sold for £370.

Freehold ground rent, £12 per annum, secured upon Nos. 7, 8, and 9, Charles-street.—Sold for £225.

By Mr. H. E. Murrell.

Freehold residence, No. 32, Lansdowne-crescent, Kensington-park-gardens; let at £105 per annum.—Sold for £1,300.

Leasehold residence, No. 36, Lansdowne-crescent; term 96 years from December, 1859; ground rent £15.—Sold for £840.

By Mr. F. Lewis.

Lease and goodwill of The Brunswick public-house, adjoining the Crystal Palace railway station, Norwood.—Sold for £495.

Improved rental of £36 10s. per annum, arising from No. 2, Trevor-terrace, Knightsbridge; term 5 years from Christmas, 1862.—Sold for £35.

August 17.—By Messrs. Norton, Hoggart, & Trist.

Leasehold residence, 13, Farleigh-villas, Pembury-rd, Clapton; let at 90 guineas per annum.—Sold for £1,100.

Leasehold residence, Sydney-house, Pembury-road; let at £100 per annum.—Sold for £1,300.

Leasehold residences, Nos. 1 and 2, Bayhall-villas, Downe's Park-road; let at £95 per annum.—Sold for £2,400.

Leasehold houses, Nos. 17 & 18, Tysen-terrace, Dalston-lane; let at £37 per annum.—Sold for £300.

August 19.—By Messrs. Norton, Hoggart, & Trist.

Freehold residence, Clapham Common, Surrey, with stabling, farmery, &c., 33a. 3r. 7p.—Sold for £24,000.

Leasehold residences, Nos. 18 and 19, Acre-lane, Clapham.—Sold for £900.

Leasehold cottage, No. 4, Park-road, Clapham.—Sold for £75.

Leasehold, three cottages, Nos. 25, 26, and 27, Windmill-street, Lyham-road, Clapham.—Sold for £155.

By Messrs. Driver.

Freehold and copyhold, Crow's Nest Farm, Harefield, Middlesex, 97a. 3r. 21p., with farmhouse and homestead.—Sold for £5,350.

Freehold cottage, garden, orchard, and premises, Harefield, 1a. 0r. 16p. —Sold for £265.

Copyhold pasture lands, 14a. 3r. 38p., Ruislip Common Field, Ruislip.—Sold for £990.

Copyhold cottage and land, West End Down, Barnes, 3a. 0r. 29p.—Sold for £310.

Copyhold residence, cottages, and land, 4a. 1r. 22p., West End, Northold. —Sold for £570.

Freehold and copyhold, 20a. 1r. 4p. meadow land, Roxeth Green, Harrow. —Sold for £1,370.

Freehold and copyhold, Tangley Park Farm, Hampton, Middlesex, comprising residence, homestead, and 353a. 1r. 31p.—Sold for £16,675.

Freehold, Chisbridge Farm, Hambledon, Bucks, comprising 306a. 2r. 4p., arable, pasture, and wood land, with farm residence and homestead, cottages, &c.—Sold for £10,300.

Freehold meadow land, Chisbridge Meadow, Skermitt, Hambledon, 2a. 0r. 2p.—Sold for £380.

Plot of meadow land, 1a. 2r. 38p., Medmenham Mead.—Sold for £100.

AT GARRAWAY'S.

August 14.—By Ellis & Son.

Leasehold residence, outbuildings, stabling, gardens, farm-yard, bailiff's cottage, pleasure grounds, &c., and 22a. 0r. 39p. meadow land, Dulwich Common, Surrey; held for 46 years from Michaelmas, 1863, at £124 12s. per annum.—Sold for £5,650.

Leasehold, lot 2, three enclosures, meadow land, 20a. 2r. 28p.; lot 3, meadow land, 16a. 2r. 4p.; lot 4, meadow land, 7a. 2r. 5p.—Sold for £300.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Windings-up of Joint Stock Companies.

Friday, Aug. 14, 1863.

Unlimited in Chancery.

Consols Insurance Association.—The Master of the Rolls, July 27, peremptory order that a call of £1 per share, made on all contributories settled in Class A. contributories of this said association, be paid on or before Sept. 1, to George Scott, Official Manager, 9, Bond-st, Walbrook.

North Wheal Exmouth Mining Company.—The Master of the Rolls, July 29, peremptory order that a call of 12s. per share, made on all contributories of this company, be paid on or before Aug. 24, to Frederick Whinney, Official Manager, 5, Serle-st, Lincoln's-inn.

Tuesday, Aug. 18, 1863.

Unlimited in Chancery.

Great Western Coal Company.—V. C. Kindersley, peremptory order that a call of £6 per share, made on all contributories of this company, be paid on or before Sept 1, to George Harvey Jay, Official Manager, 3, Moorgate-st.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

Friday, Aug. 14, 1863.

Atkinson, Thos, Kingston-upon-Hull, Merchant's Clerk. Sept 21. Rollit, Hull.

Ballance, John, Lower Clapton, Esq. Sept 7. Davidson & Co, Weaver's Hall, Basinghall-st.

Barnett, John Fielder, Sloane-st, Middlesex, Draper. Oct 14. Hill & Son, Throgmorton-st.

Carman, Mary Ann (formerly Mary Ann Fowler), Bruton-st, Middx, Widow. Sept 30. Fyson & Co, Frederick's-pl, Old Jewry.

Champion, Wm, Farmcott, Gloucester, Farmer. Sept 29. Kersdale & Son, Burton-on-the-Water.

Chichester, Amy, Stowford, Swimbridge, Devon, Spinster. Oct 31. Tucker, Barnstaple.

Goodwin, Jane, Lewis-st, Kentish-town, Widow. Sept 1. Keene, Scott's-yard, Bush-lane.

Griffiths, John Rogers, Heavitree, Devon, Esq. Sept 15. Ford, Southernhay, Exeter.

Hotham, Hon Geo Fredk, Brighton, Vice-Admiral in the Royal Navy. Nov 1. Bennett & Co, New-sq, Lincoln's-inn.

Kershaw, Robt, Manch, Gent. Oct 1. Kershaw & Bullock, Manch.

Mather, Mary, Tring, Herts, Widow. Oct 12. Beddome, Nicholas-lane, Lombard-st.

Pearce, Jas Wm, Knowle Green, Staines, Esq. Oct 1. Abbott & Wheatley, Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane.

Smith, Mary, Wakefield, Widow. Sept 27. Harrison & Smith, Wakefield.

Tuesday, Aug. 18, 1863.

Abbott, Vernon, Upper Gower-st, Bedford-sq. Sept 30. Cooper, East Dareham.

Bainbridge, John Nathan, St Martin's-lane, Charing-cross, M.D. Nov 2. Taylor & Co, Gt James-st, Bedford-row.

Barnby, Hy, Southtown, otherwise Little Yarmouth, Merchant. Nov 14. Worship, Gt Yarmouth.

Johnston, John, Lpool, Book-keeper. Oct 14. Conway, Lpool.

Lumbert, Richd Paris Collett, Burghfield, Berks, Land Agent. Sept 15. Jameson, Verulam-buildings, Gray's-inn.

Richardson, Hannah, Bromsgrove, Worcester, Widow. Oct 15. Sanders, Bromsgrove.

Ruffles, John, Trimley St. Martin, Suffolk, Miller and Farmer. Oct 1. Daniel, Ipswich.

Rutger, Thos, Devonport, Gent. Oct 10. Gard, Devonport.

Stainton, Richd, Kensington-house, Maghull, Lancaster, Wine Merchant. Oct 14. Conway, Lpool.

Stares, Robt Hatch, Droxford, Southampton, Esq. March 1, Gunner, Bishop's Waltham.

Vernon, Elizabeth, Appledore, Devon, Spinster. Oct 1. Buse, Bideford.

Walker, Geo, New Broad-st, Iron Merchant. Nov 2. Clarke & Morice, Coleman-st.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

Friday, Aug. 14, 1863.

Barker, Jonathan, Ardwick, Manch, Minister of the Gospel. April 16. Calvert v. Armitage, V. C. Wood.

Conway, Hon Hy Seymour, Rue Taitbout, Paris. Oct 29. Wallace v. Attorney-General, M.R.

Cooper, Benj, Stamford, Baron, Northampton, Esq. Oct 29. Hutchinson v. Yeatman, M. R.

Cottrell, Saml, Edgbaston, Warwick, Gent. Nov 9. Cottrell v. Cottrell, V. C. Stuart.

Davies, Thos Phillips, Poland-st, Middx, Labourer. Nov 17. Duke v. Edwards, M. R.

James, Wm, Spalding, Lincoln, Lime Burner. Nov 10. Wilkinson v. Coddington, V. C. Wood.

Jacob, Thos, Packenham, Suffolk, Farmer. Nov 5. Robinson v. Evans, V. C. Kindersley.

Marriott, Hy, Nuneaton, Warwick, Grocer. Oct 29. Nason v. Marriott, M.R.

Palmer, Edward Rouch, La Billeterie, France, Esq. Oct 29. Palmer v. Palmer, M. R.

Pearse, Geddie, Woodlands Cottage, Wanstead, Esq. Oct 29. Fontayne v. Pearse, M. R.

Tompkins, Edward, Hagley, Worcester. Oct 29. Potter v. Tompkins, M. R.

Ware, Joseph, Uffculme, Devon, Solicitor. Oct 29. Ware v. Harris, M. R.

Whitaker, John, Upton, Nottingham, Farmer. Nov 10. Doncaster v. Whitaker, V. C. Stuart.

Whitgreave, Geo Thos, Eaton-sq, Pimlico, Esq. Oct 30. Whitgreave v. Whitgreave, M. R.

Whiting, Hy McLaughlin, Bath-rd, Hounslow, Farmer. Nov 2. Whiting v. Nicholes, V. C. Stuart.

Williams, Jas Lee, Beaconsfield, Buckingham, Maltster. Nov 3. Webster v. Williams, V. C. Stuart.

TUESDAY, Aug. 18, 1863.

Weller, Jas, Battersea, Farmer. Nov 1. Weller v. Weller, V. C. Stuart.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, Aug. 14, 1863.

Ashley, John Seargill, Sheffield, Auctioneer. July 31. Conv. Reg Aug 14.
Ashton, Jas, Stratford, Butcher. July 18. Comp. Reg Aug 14.
Barnes, Hy, Preston, Shopkeeper. July 16. Asst. Reg Aug 12.
Boyd, Chas, Barnes, Surrey, Assistant Registrar-General of Seamen. Aug 7. Letter of Licence. Reg Aug 13.
Bradbury, Wm, Sutton, Chester, Silk Manufacturer. Aug 5. Conv. Reg Aug 13.
Burditt, Robt Sharp, Rowell, Northampton, Butcher. July 27. Conv. Reg Aug 11.
Davies, John, Brynmawr, Brecon, Grocer. July 28. Conv. Reg Aug 13.
Evans, Hy, Manch, Silk Broker. July 31. Asst. Reg Aug 13.
Fischer, Joseph, & Wm Martyn, Bear's Head-yard, King-st, Westminster, Builders. Aug 11. Asst. Reg Aug 14.
Frood, Thos, Lpool, Draper. July 20. Asst. Reg Aug 13.
Gordon, Robt, Wrexham, Draper. July 18. Arr. Reg Aug 14.
Gray, David, John-st, Upper North-st, Poplar New Town, Corn Dealer. July 30. Asst. Reg Aug 14.
Halsted, John, Burnley, Lancaster, Stone Mason. July 29. Asst. Reg Aug 13.
Irving, Matthew, Leicester, Carver. July 21. Conv. Reg Aug 14.
Jenkins, John Thos, Grange, Torquay, Lodging-house Keeper. July 24. Conv. Reg Aug 12.
Joce, John, Colchester, Surgeon. July 18. Comp. Reg Aug 13.
Jordan, John, Wolverhampton, Victualler. July 13. Conv. Reg Aug 10.
Kilroy, John, Bolton, Butter Merchant. July 29. Comp. Reg Aug 13.
Lawrence, David, Coventry, Accountant's Clerk. July 31. Arr. Reg Aug 13.
Lawrence, Hugh Mullenoux, Lpool, Iron Shipbuilder. Aug 11. Conv. Reg Aug 13.
Lewis, Wm Lambton, Sudbury, Suffolk, Tea Dealer. July 18. Comp. Reg Aug 13.
MacManus, Dominic, Bishop Auckland, Broker. July 27. Conv. Reg Aug 13.
Marshall, Spencer, Chadwell, Leicester, Grocer. July 18. Conv. Reg Aug 14.
McAfee, John, Jarrow, Durham, Grocer. Dec 23. Asst. Reg Aug 12.
McClure, Thos, Lawrence-lane, Cheapside, Warehouseman. July 16. Conv. Reg Aug 12.
Mincher, Wm, Birm, Spoon Manufacturer. July 28. Asst. Reg Aug 13.
Muir, Joseph, Lpool, Draper. July 23. Asst. Reg Aug 12.
Mullanny, Bernard, Birm, Grocer. July 17. Conv. Reg Aug 11.
Rhodes, John, Hulme, Builder. July 23. Asst. Reg Aug 12.
Richer, Thos Chas, & Edward Philip Cox, Lpool, Hosiers. July 29. Comp. Reg Aug 12.
Roberts, Evan Morris, Edern, Carnarvon, Shopkeeper. July 18. Asst. Reg Aug 13.
Scott, Walter, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Chemist. July 14. Conv. Reg Aug 11.
Sharratt, Wm, Newbould, Chesterfield, Earthenware Manufacturer. July 14. Conv. Reg Aug 11.
Spencer, John Frampton, High-st, St John's-wood, Builder. July 24. Asst. Reg Aug 12.
Storey, Wm Thos, Salford, Baker. July 18. Comp. Reg Aug 13.
Whitworth, Jas Robertshaw, Lpool, Provision Merchant. July 15. Comp. Reg Aug 12.

TUESDAY, Aug. 18, 1863.

Barkley, Alex, Lpool, Grocer. July 17. Comp. Reg Aug 14.
Booth, John Cartwright, Sheffield, Table Knife Manufacturer. Aug 5. Conv. Reg Aug 17.
Burkinshaw, Wm, West Bar, Sheffield, Tobacconist. July 20. Conv. Reg Aug 15.
Carruthers, Geo, Manch, Chemist and Druggist. July 18. Asst. Reg Aug 14.
Crompton, Jas, Bolton, Engineer. July 23. Conv. Reg Aug 17.
Green, Chas, Marsh, nr Huddersfield, Blubber and Spinner. Aug 5. Conv. Reg Aug 17.
Heelas, Carey, West Bromwich, Brewer. Aug 3. Asst. Reg Aug 15.
Humphreys, Richd Green, Strand, Hosier. July 31. Asst. Reg Aug 18.
Hunt, Jas Edward, Wandsworth-rd, Surrey, Iron Merchant, July 23. Asst. Reg Aug 18.
Jefferson, Joseph, Accrington, Joiner and Builder. Aug 1. Comp. Reg Aug 17.
Jones, Wm Joseph, Rowley Regis, Stafford, Anvil and Anchor Dealer. Aug 14. Comp. Reg Aug 18.
Love, Richd, South Marston, Wilts, Farmer. July 18. Asst. Reg Aug 15.
McCormick, Wm, Leicester, Draper. July 20. Conv. Reg Aug 17.
McGuffie, Jas, Oxford, Draper. July 20. Comp. Reg Aug 17.
Midgley, Abraham, Accrington, Lancaster, Cotton Spinner. July 3. Asst. Reg Aug 14.
Milne, Geo, Barham, nr Canterbury, Trainer of Horses. Aug 14. Conv. Reg Aug 15.
Pearce, John Marfell, Ross, Hereford, Grocer. Aug 4. Conv. Reg Aug 17.
Pickard, Wm, Bury, Lancaster, Druggist. July 23. Asst. Reg Aug 18.
Powell, John, Mullhampton, Upton Bishop, Hereford, Farmer. Aug 3. Conv. Reg Aug 18.
Salmon, Wm, South Ash, Kent, Farmer. July 29. Conv. Reg Aug 14.
Walker, Edwd Richd, Cardington-st, Hampstead-rd, Wire Worker. Aug 11. Asst. Reg Aug 15.
Whitelegg, Jas, Stockport, Cotton Spinner. July 21. Asst. Reg Aug 15.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Aug. 14, 1863.

To Surrender in London.

Altmann, Edw Geo, High-st, Whitechapel, Oilman. Pet Aug 11. Sept 1 at 11. Hobbs, Cornhill.
Brain, Fredk, Stanmore-pl, High-st, Camden Town, Ivory Cutter. Pet Aug 11 (for pau). Sept 1 at 12. Aldridge.
Buckingham, Geo, Beckford-rd, Walworth, Bootmaker. Pet Aug 11. Sept 1 at 11. Few & Cole, High-st, Southwark.
Dickinson, Saml Thornton, Stanley-st, Pimlico, Accountant. Pet Aug 10. Sept 1 at 11. Smith, Denbigh-st, Belgrave-rd, Pimlico.
Ellis, John, Weston-st, King's-cross, Confectioner. Pet Aug 11. Sept 1 at 11. Wood & Ring, Coleman-st-buildings.
Frier, Thos, William-st, Regent's-park, Middx, Commission Agent. Pet Aug 12. Sept 1 at 12. Leader, Orchard-st, Portman-sq.
Horspool, Wm, Montagu-st, Russell-sq, Grocer. Pet Aug 11. Aug 26 at 2. Alderton, Connaught-ter, Edgware-rd.
Jupson, John, jun, Clarendon-ter, Maida-hill, Horsekeeper. Pet Aug 11. Sept 1 at 11. Hill, Basinghall-st.
Newman, Geo, Sunny Vale, Tunbridge Wells, Auctioneer. Pet Aug 12. Sept 1 at 12. Haise & Trustram, Cheapside.
Nicholls, Wm, Egleton-pl, Bromley, Pattern Maker. Pet Aug 12. Aug 26 at 2. Wood & Ring, Coleman-st-buildings.
Page, John, Stucley-ter, High-st, Camden Town, Baker. Pet Aug 11. Aug 26 at 1. Hare, Basinghall-st.
Perry, Hy Fowler, Tatsfield, Surrey, Farmer. Pet Aug 13. Aug 26 at 2. Harrison & Lewis, Old Jewry.
Reynolds, John, Lower Belgrave-st, Pimlico, out of business. Pet Aug 10. Aug 26 at 12. Stinton, Margaret-st, Cavendish-sq.
Smith, Robt, Gloucester-st, Hexton, Plumber. Pet Aug 10. Aug 26 at 2. Juckes, Basinghall-st.
Sykes, John Matthew, Upper Clifton-st, Finsbury Market, Chair Maker. Pet Aug 10. Aug 26 at 1. Holt & Mason, Quality-ct, Chancery-lane.
Taylor, Robt, Princes-st, Edgeware-rd, Cab Driver. Pet Aug 7 (for pau). Aug 26 at 1. Aldridge.
Vickers, Benj, Charles-ter, Bishop's-rd, Victoria-park, out of business. Pet Aug 7 (for pau). Aug 26 at 1. Aldridge.
Vincent, Wm Newton, Old Palace-yard, Westminster, Messenger in the Comptroller-General's Office. Pet Aug 12. Sept 1 at 12. Lewis & Lewis, Ely-pl.
Wade, Elizabeth Agnes, Augustus-sq, Regent's-park, Spinster. Pet Aug 11. Sept 1 at 11. Begbie, Essex-st, Strand.
Willding, John Harrison, Bexley, Kent, out of business. Pet Aug 12. Sept 1 at 12. Marshall & Son, Hatton-garden.
Wills, John Fisher, Windsor-cottages, Haverstock-hill, Oil and Spice Merchant. Pet Aug 12 (for pau). Sept 1 at 12. Loxley & Morley, Cheapside.
Young, Francis, Chapel-pl, Coldharbour-lane, Literary Writer. Pet Aug 12. Sept 8 at 11. Tombs, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
Young, Thos, Eastbourne, Sussex, Market Gardener. Pet Aug 12. Aug 26 at 2. Tippetts, Size-lane.

To Surrender in the Country.

Alps, Jas, Brigg, Lincoln, Grocer's Assistant. Pet Aug 6. Brigg, Aug 27 at 11. Todd, Hull.
Ashby, John, Northampton, Butcher. Pet Aug 11. Northampton, Aug 29 at 3. Shield & White, Northampton.
Baker, Thos, Selby, York, Potato Merchant. Pet Aug 13. Leeds, Aug 31 at 11.15. Bantoft, Selby, and Carine & Tempest, Leeds.
Bennett, John, Bristol, Grocer. Pet Aug 12. Bristol, Sept 4 at 12. Hill, Bristol.
Bradney, Thos, Wolverhampton, Attorney's Clerk. Pet. Wolverhampton, Sept 28 at 12. Dallow, Wolverhampton.
Brown, Jonathan, Aspatria, Cumberland, Common Brewer. Pet Aug 1. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Aug 24 at 11.30. Chater & Chater, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Brown, Saml, Walkley, nr Sheffield, Quarryman. Pet Aug 13. Sheffield, Aug 29 at 10. Mason, Sheffield.
Burton, John, Macclesfield, Pig Dealer. Pet Aug 6. Manch, Aug 24 at 11. Barclay, Macclesfield.
Butcher, Alexander, Birm, Draper. Adj Aug 11. Birm, Sept 28 at 12. James & Co, Birm.
Carruthers, David, Blackburn, Reed Maker. Pet Aug 10. Blackburn, Aug 31 at 1. Backhouse, Blackburn.
Chick, John, Hereford, Baker. Pet Aug 10. Birm, Aug 24 at 12. Averill, Hereford, and Hodgson & Co, Birm.
Child, John, Felton Winford, Somerset, Farmer. Pet Aug 4 (for pau). Bristol, Sept 4 at 12. King & Plummer, Bristol.
Cosnett, Robt, Wolverhampton, Market Gardener. Pet. Wolverhampton, Sept 28 at 12. Bartlett, Wolverhampton.
Cowell, Wm, Thirsk, York, Horse Dealer. Pet Aug 11. Leeds, Aug 31 at 11. North & Son, Leeds.
Creasy, Wm, Tonbridge Wells, Butcher. Pet Aug 10. Tonbridge Wells, Aug 28 at 1. Crippe, Tonbridge Wells.
Cushion, John, Stamford, Coal Merchant. Pet Aug 13. Nottingham, Aug 25 at 11. Law, Stamford.
Davis, Hy David, Arle, Cheltenham, Cattle Dealer. Pet Aug 8. Cheltenham, Aug 25 at 11. Marshall, Cheltenham.
Griffiths, Wm Richd, Retreat, Durdham Down, Bristol, Horticultural Engineer. Pet Aug 10. Bristol, Sept 4 at 12. Henderson, Bristol.
Harding, Thos Massey, Stourbridge, Worcester, Apothecary. Pet Aug 12. Birm, Sept 7 at 12. Collis, Stourbridge.
Harper, Hy, Houghton-le-Spring, Durham, Publican. Pet Aug 10. Durham, Aug 26 at 12. Marshall, Durham.
Humphris, Geo Thos, Birm, Eating-house Keeper. Pet Aug 11. Birm, Sept 28 at 10. Homer, Birm.
Hussey, John, Bath, Boarhouse Keeper. Pet Aug 6. Bath, Aug 24 at 11. Bartrum, Bath.
Johnson, Saml, Gt Wigston, Leicester, Baker. Pet Aug 12. Leicester, Aug 29 at 10. Davis & Owston, Leicester.
Jones, John, Mold, Flint, Watch Maker. Adj July 8. Mold, Sept 15 at 12. Parry.
Jones, Sophia, Longton, Stafford, Widow. Pet Aug 11. Stoke-upon-Trent, Aug 29 at 11. Hawley, Longton.
Keates, John, Willenhall, Stafford, Furniture Broker. Pet. Wolverhampton, Sept 28 at 12. Duignan, Walsall.
Knowles, Wm, Bollington, Chester, Stone Mason. Pet Aug 13. Macclesfield, Sept 3 at 11. Barclay, Macclesfield.
Lockley, Jas, Wolverhampton, Tobacconist. Pet. Wolverhampton, Sept 28 at 12. Underhill, Wolverhampton.
Marr, Robt, Kingston-upon-Hull, Draper's Assistant. Pet Aug 13. Kingston-upon-Hull, Aug 26 at 12. Chester, Hull.
McConnell, Alex, Les Pale-rd, Guildford, Draper. Pet Aug 8. Guildford, Aug 29 at 12.30. White, Guildford.

Moor, John, Kingston-upon-Hull, Seed Crusher. Pet Aug 12. Kingston-upon-Hull, Sept 2 at 12. Hearfield, Hull.
Morgan, Richd, Usk, Monmouth, Innkeeper. Pet Aug 6. Usk, Sept 5 at 12. Shepard, Tredegar.
Northam, Wm, Exeter, Whitesmith. Pet Aug 12. Exeter, Aug 26 at 11. Flood, Exeter.
Pickering, John, & Saml Rowe Sanders, Rotherham, York, Railway Waggon Builders. Pet Aug 1. Sheffield, Aug 29 at 10. Smith & Burdekin, Sheffield.
Pritchard, Wm, Derby, Tobacconist. Pet Aug 13. Nottingham, Aug 25 at 11. Allen, Derby.
Reid, Wm, Birm, Draper. Pet Aug 10. Birm, Sept 7 at 12. Webb, Birm.
Roebuck, Thos, Rusholme, nr Manch, Attorney's Clerk. Pet Aug 11. Manch, Sept 21 at 9.30. Swan, Manch.
Sax, Abraham, Birm, Glass Dealer. Adj Aug 11. Birm, Sept 28 at 12. James & Co, Birm.
Shorrock, Yates, Over Darwen, Victualler. Pet Aug 11. Manch, Aug 25 at 11. Smith & Boyer, Manch.
Smith, Fras, Boston, Grocer. Pet Aug 11. Nottingham, Aug 25 at 11. Bailes, Boston.
Tanner, John, Weston-super-Mare, Cabinet Maker. Pet Aug 10. Bristol, Aug 25 at 11. Smith & Raby, Weston-super-Mare.
Townsend, Chas, Birm, Surgeon. Pet Aug 1. Birm, Aug 26 at 12. Hodgson & Co, Birm.
White, Hy, Bilston, Stafford, Plumber. Pet. Wolverhampton, Sept 28 at 12. Underhill, Wolverhampton.
Whittem, Jas Hy, Menden, Warwick, out of employment. Pet Aug 11. Birm, Sept 28 at 10. Powell & Son, Birm.
Wilcombe, Chas, Doulting, nr Shepton-Mallet, Somerset, Baker. Pet Aug 8. Wells, Aug 23 at 4. Reed, Bridgwater.
Wiggins, Thos, Bury-fields, Guildford, Bargeman. Pet Aug 5. Guildford, Sept 5 at 1. White, Guildford.
Wilson, Edmund, Leicester, Carpenter. Pet Aug 6. Lutterworth, Aug 31 at 12. Davis & Ouston, Leicester.
Wilson, Jas, & Walter Slater, Lpool, Merchants. Pet Aug 11. Lpool, Sept 4 at 11. Forshaw & Co, Lpool.
Wilson, Wm, & Saml Foster, Kingston-upon-Hull, Iron Founders. Pet Aug 12. Kingston-upon-Hull, Sept 2 at 12. Rollitt & Son, Hull.

TUESDAY, August 18, 1863.

To Surrender in London.

Adams, Thos, Southampton, Victualler. Pet Aug 15. Sept 2 at 12. Paterson & Son, Bouverie-st, and Mackey, Southampton.
Christy, Andrew, Sun-ct, Cornhill, Commission Agent. Pet Aug 15. Sept 1 at 2. Mirfin, Staple-inn, Holborn.
Collins, Thos, Silver-ter, Millwall, Poplar, Builder. Pet Aug 13. Sept 1 at 1. Drew, New Basinghall-st.
Coltman, Rchd Brickwood, Brewer-st, Golden-sq, Importer and Manufacturer of Sewing Machines. Pet Aug 12. Sept 2 at 12. Hill, Basinghall-st.
Eisenstein, Wm, Hatton-garden, Exporter of Watches. Pet Aug 1. Sept 1 at 1. Howell, Cheapside.
Furness, Geo, jun, Cannon-st, Provision Merchant. Pet Aug 7. Sept 1 at 1. Linklaters & Hackwood, Walbrook.
Gallenx, Jules Nicolas, Haberdashers'-pl, Hoxton, Merchant. Pet Aug 12 (for pau). Sept 2 at 11. Aldridge.
Harris, Geo, Aldersgate-st, Working Watch Jobber. Pet Aug 10. Sept 1 at 11. Sumner, Pancras-lane.
Harris, Thos Hy, Old Ford-bridge, Victoria-park, Beershop Keeper. Pet Aug 10. Sept 2 at 11. Marshall, Basinghall-st.
Hewitt, Hy, Kildare-ter, Bayswater, Coachman. Pet Aug 13. Sept 2 at 11. Juckes, Basinghall-st.
High, John, Coldharbour-st, Hackney-rd, Machine Sawyer. Pet Aug 12 (for pau). Sept 2 at 11. Aldridge.
Hodges, Geo, Green-st, Bethnal-green, Cheesemonger's Assistant. Pet Aug 12 (for pau). Sept 2 at 1. Aldridge.
Holden, Chas, Brunswick-grove, Cromer-st, Gray's-inn-rd, Undertaker. Pet Aug 12 (for pau). Sept 2 at 12. Aldridge.
Johnson, Thos, Southampton-ter, Lambeth, Attorney-at-Law. Pet Aug 13 (for pau). Sept 1 at 1. Aldridge.
Jones, Geo Dyke, Glasgow-ter, Pimlico, Commercial Clerk. Pet Aug 12 (for pau). Sept 1 at 12. Aldridge.
Lawrance, Benjamin, Great May's-buildings, St Martin's-lane, out of business. Pet Aug 15. Sept 1 at 2. Newstead, Ely-pl, Holborn.
Masters, Thos, Park-st, Camden Town, Cook and Confectioner. Pet Aug 11 (for pau). Sept 2 at 12. Aldridge.
M'Dowall, Andrew, Above Bar, Southampton, Saddler. Pet Aug 14. Sept 1 at 1. Paterson & Son, Bouverie-st, Fleet-st, agents for Mackay, Southampton.
Sherrington, Francis, Charlotte-st, New-cut, Lambeth, Pastry Cook. Pet Aug 13. Sept 1 at 1. Porter, Coleman-st.
Smith, John, Millbrook-rd, Brixton, out of business. Pet Aug 13. Sept 2 at 11. Hill, Basinghall-st.
Starling, Saml, High Holborn, Hosier and Glover. Pet Aug 14. Sept 1 at 1. Mansfield, Ampton-pl, Gray's-inn-road.
Stern, Edw, Threadneedle-st, Ship Broker. Pet Aug 5. Sept 2 at 12. Lindus, Bedford-row.
Taylor, David, York-rd, Lambeth, out of business. Pet Aug 7. Sept 2 at 12. Oliver, Bank-chambers, Lothbury.
Trendall, Thos, Brunswick-st, Brunswick-sq, Middx, Grocer. Pet Aug 14. Sept 2 at 11. Harcourt, King's-arms-yard.

To Surrender in the Country.

Allan, Joseph, Kendal, Westmorland, Labourer. Pet Aug 15. Kendal, Sept 1 at 11. Thomson, Kendal.
Arnold, Wm, Cardiff, Grocer. Pet Aug 13. Cardiff, Aug 28 at 11. Ingledew, Cardiff.
Atkinson, John, Mason, Lincoln, out of business. Pet July 24. Kingston-upon-Hull, Sept 2 at 12. Cartwright & Son, Bawtry, and Blackburn, Leeds.
Atkinson, Joseph, Bishopwearmouth, Plasterer. Pet Aug 12. Sunderland, Sept 1 at 12. McRae, Sunderland.
Auty, Ann, Dewsbury, York, Grocer. Pet Aug 14. Dewsbury, Sept 18 at 2. Scholes & Son, Dewsbury.
Beard, Jas, Wolverhampton, Victualler. Adj Aug 10. Birm, Sept 4 at 12.
Brown, Nathan, Greenheys, Manch, out of business. Pet Aug 14. Manch, Sept 21 at 9.30. Mann, Manch.
Bunning, Ellen, Market Harborough, Pastry Cook. Pet Aug 12. Market Harborough, Sept 1 at 10. Douglass, Market Harborough.
Burgoine, John, Sheffield, Painter. Pet Aug 15. Sheffield, Sept 3 at 2. Broadbent, Sheffield.
Butler, Chas Edwd, Birm, Wire Worker. Pet Aug 14. Birm, Sept 7 at 12. Barber, Birm.
Cavill, Geo, Newtown, Cardiff, Miller's Foreman. Pet Aug 13. Cardiff, Aug 28 at 11. Ensor, Cardiff.
Charlesworth, Matthew, Overton, nr Wakefield, Farmer. Pet Aug 14. Wakefield, Aug 29 at 11. Barratt, Wakefield.
Coward, Wm, Grasmere, Westmorland, out of business. Pet Aug 12. Ambleside, Sept 2 at 12. Nicholson, Ambleside.
Dove, Jas, North Witham, Lincoln, Victualler. Pet Aug 13. Grantham, Aug 27 at 11.30. Law, Stamford.
Eley, Chas, Wicken, Northampton, Butcher. Pet Aug 11. Towcester, Sept 7 at 11.30. White, Northampton.
Farrall, John, Hanley, Stafford, Commission Agent. Pet Aug 14. Birm, Sept 7 at 12. Smith, Birm.
French, John Wm, Manch, Innkeeper. Pet Aug 8. Manch, Aug 31 at 11. Farrar, Manch.
Harrison, John, North Wing, Bradford, Waste Dealer. Pet Aug 14. Bradford, Aug 28 at 10.30. Hill, Bradford.
Hawksworth, Matthew, St Leonard's, Leicester, Victualler. Pet Aug 13. Leicester, Aug 29 at 10. Haxby, Leicester.
Higley, Thos, sen, Habberley, Salop, Wheelwright. Pet Aug 14. Shrewsbury, Sept 7 at 10. Davies, Shrewsbury.
Hill, Elijah, North Nibley, Gloucester, Haulier. Pet Aug 8. Dursley, Aug 31 at 12. Clutterbuck, Stroud.
Holland, Hy, Rusholme, nr Manch, Engine Packing Maker. Pet Aug 14. Manch, Sept 21 at 9.30. Hodgson, Manch.
Hood, Michael, Plaitford, Wilts, Wheelright. Pet Aug 3. Romsey, Aug 26 at 12. Mackey, Southampton.
Hopkins, Abednego David, Neath, Glamorgan, Lime Burner. Pet Aug 13. Bristol, Aug 28 at 11. Simons & Plews, Merthyr Tydfil.
Huicks, Wm, Nelson-st, Cardiff, Builder. Adj Aug 14. Bristol, Sept 1 at 11. Brittan, Bristol.
Jackson, Wm, Coningsby, Lincoln, Farmer. Pet Aug 12. Horncastle, Aug 26 at 11. Brackenbury, Alford.
Jefferies, Wm, Weston-super-Mare, Shopkeeper. Pet Aug 12. Weston-super-Mare, Sept 1 at 12. Smith, Weston-super-Mare.
Jenkins, Lewis, Mountain Ash, nr Aberdare, Carpenter. Adj. Bristol, Sept 1 at 11. Brittan, Bristol.
Jones, Daniel, Hulme, Tailor. Pet Aug 12. Salford, Aug 29 at 9.30. Jones, Manch.
Lisadale, Jas, Birm, Coppersmith. Adj Aug 11. Birm, Sept 4 at 12.
Lister, Fras, Gt Grimsby, Butcher. Pet Aug 13 (for pau). Lincoln, Aug 27 at 11. Brown & Son, Lincoln.
Manchee, Geo, Southampton, Merchant's Clerk. Pet Aug 10. Southampton, Sept 1 at 12. Mackey, Southampton.
McDonnell, Ennis, Birm, Travelling Draper. Adj Aug 11. Birm, Sept 28 at 10.
McMullin, Abraham, Cockermouth, Cumberland, Watchmaker. Pet Aug 14. Cockermouth, Aug 31 at 3. Mordaff, Cockermouth.
Medder, Wm, Lpool, out of business. Pet Aug 14. Lpool, Aug 28 at 1. Parker, Lpool.
Overall, Charles, Great Bardfield, Essex, Boot Maker. Pet Aug 13. Dunmow, Sept 23 at 10. Cardinall, Halsted.
Poultney, Thos, Coventry, Victualler. Pet Aug 12. Coventry, Sept 2 at 3. Smallbone, Coventry.
Pridgeon, Saml, Luton, Bedford, Draper. Pet Aug 12. Luton, Aug 28 at 10. Shepherd, Luton.
Riddit, Ambrose, Over Wallop, Hants, Baker. Pet Aug 12. Romsey, Aug 26 at 12. Mackey, Southampton.
Smith, Edw, Bank Top, within Blackburn, Iron and Tin Plate Worker. Pet Aug 10. Blackburn, Aug 31 at 1. Wheeler & Co, Blackburn.
Smith, John Wm, Birm, Trimming Manufacturer. Adj Aug 11. Birm, Sept 4 at 12.
Taylor, Thos Graveley, Cheltenham, Builder. Pet Aug 15. Bristol, Aug 28 at 11. New & Co, Evesham, and Whittington & Gribble, Bristol.
Teague, Anna Susan, Redruth, Cornwall, Widow. Pet Aug 15. Exeter, Sept 4 at 1. Paull & Linton, Redruth, and Campion, Exeter.
West, Jas Thos, Fillingham, Kent, Caulker in H.M.'s Dockyard at Chatham. Pet Aug 14. Rochester, Aug 29 at 12. Hayward, Rochester.
Williams, John, Llanfair, Montgomery, Saddler. Adj June 17. Welchpool, Sept 10 at 11. Jones, Welchpool.

BANKRUPTCY ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Aug. 14, 1863.

Cooke, Frederic, Hilton, nr St. Ives, out of business. Aug 11.

BANKRUPTCIES IN IRELAND.

Bianconi, Charles, jun, formerly of Longfield, Tipperary, then of Lower Leeson-st, Dublin, then of Wicklow, afterwards travelling abroad, Gentleman. To surr in London, Aug 25 at 2.
Davidson, Geo, Limerick, Dealer in Fish. To surr Aug 28 and Sept 17.
Jones, Charles, Dublin, House Painter. To surr Aug 25 and Sept 17.
M'Murdy, William Hugh, Coleraine, Stationer and Printer. To surr Aug 25 and Sept 17.
Murphy, John, Castlebar, Grocer. To surr Aug 28 and Sept 17.

SLACK'S SILVER ELECTRO PLATE is a coating of pure Silver over Nickel. A combination of two metals possessing such valuable properties renders it in appearance and wear equal to Sterling Silver.

	Fiddle Pattern.		Thread.		King's.	
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.		£ s. d.	
Table Forks, per doz.....	1 10 0	and 1 15 0	2 8 0		3 0 0	
Dessert ditto	1 0 0	and 1 10 0	1 15 0		2 2 0	
Table Spoons	1 10 0	and 1 15 0	2 8 0		3 0 0	
Dessert ditto	1 0 0	and 1 10 0	1 15 0		2 2 0	
Tea Spoons	0 12 0	and 0 18 0	1 3 6		1 10 0	

Every Article for the Table as in Silver.—A Sample Tea Spoon forwarded on receipt of 20 stamps.